SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Procurement procedures in the Ministry of Defence and their effect on National Security

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am glad that finally we are having a discussion on a subject which we have been pressing for quite some time. In fact, I am going to restrict intentionally my discussion on the basis of the letters that we exchanged, because I don't want to bring in new subjects and then face the consequence in the form of replies that this is secret, that this is something sensitive, and there would be no answers. Therefore, whatever I am going to raise, the issues that I am going to highlight, would be on the basis of the exchange of letters that have taken place, by and large, between the hon. Minister and myself. These have been circulated to every Member of this House and the other House and have been widely published in all the newspapers. Therefore, I don't think that there is anything left to be said about the sensitivity of these issues. If the issue is going to be sensitive, then, I am going to request him, or, in fact, demand that a JPC be created because it is my contention, and also the contention of my group, that serious national concerns are involved, national security is involved, in the way this procurement business has been carried out. It is not my charge that this has happened now. It is also not my charge that this happened in the previous Government headed by the BJP. This has been going on for some time. But, unfortunately, a serious debate on this subject has never taken place. The reason has always been that it is a sensitive issue, and, therefore, it is not in the national interest to discuss it. A lot of things, which are really in national interest, have been pushed under the carpet, have been entire House must look at it objectively because the issues, which I am going to place before this House, are not on the basis of one party making a charge against the other party. It is the concern regarding the national security. Therefore, I am going to confine myself to the issues that have already been raised, and, therefore, nothing new is going to come away.

Sir, one of the issues with which I have been seriously concerned is agents, middlemen, middle companies and traders, who are playing a very important role in the procurement of defence items, defence systems and defence spares by the Ministry of Defence.

Although, from 1985-86 onwards, after the celebrated Bofors case, the Government has been saying that we have no middlemen, we have banned agents, we have nothing to do with traders, we deal directly with manufacturers, I shall prove that this is not so. I shall prove that this House, the Parliament and the whole nation, have been misled from 1985-86 onwards and that nothing has changed. In fact, it is getting worse and it is taking a toll of our national security, both short-term and long-term, and this is what I want to say.

I am just going to read a small para from what the hon. Minister wrote to me on the 13th of April. He says, "As for the alleged presence of agents, middlemen, middle companies, you will recall that after the unearthing of the scandal in the deal relating to 155 weapon system with Bofors, the presence of agents in defence deals was banned. Appropriate penal clauses are incorporated in all the contracts signed by the Ministry of Defence and these provisions have only been made more stringent with the passage of time. If you have any specific instances involving the presence of middlemen, etc., we would request you to share with us so that we can take suitable action". I would also like to read a very short paragraph from my response, to which, unfortunately, there was no answer. I responded subsequently and said, "I am not alleging the presence of middlemen. I am charging that there is no defence deal without the presence of middlemen, agents, traders and middle companies. This is known to the Ministry and a lot has been written about it in all the newspapers and I would suggest that you ask your senior officials as to the role of the Nandas, the Chaudharies, the Khannas, the Jajodias, the Hindujas, the Mittals, etc.". And since then, I have got three or four more names -- Mr. Pushpinder Singh Chopra, Mr. Anand Kumar Jain and Parshvadev Gupta. Now, these are the names and I have in my possession also the names of the companies that they represent all over the world. If the hon. Minister agrees to a JPC, I shall give conclusive evidence that these companies in different parts of the world are represented by these prominent agents. Of course, there must be many more.

Now, what happens when we keep these things secret, when we have a public stance that we do not have agents, we do not have middlemen, we do not have traders and, yet, there are agents; and now -- because the defence deals from 1985 to now have become so big -- we have political facilitators also. The agent may get two, five, or eight, per cent, but the facilitator may get 25 to 30 per cent. This is happening; and there are cases. We have seen

in the Bofors case; that is a poor isolated case. Since then, they have grown in size and, yet, till yesterday, the Ministry of Defence's stand is that there are no agents, there are no middlemen, there are no traders, or, call them what you like. Now, while I am on this subject, I would like to just read a few words of what a senior Secretary of the Ministry of Defence had to say on this subject. He says, "Today, some of the companies in East Europe are not manufacturing on their own. They are supplying only when they get money and other things from some of the traders, whom you call as middlemen. We deal with these traders after getting confirmation from the concerned Governments".

"So, there are cases relating to Eastern Europe where we are dealing with traders, and not the original manufacturers because of the circumstances." So, here is an admission. We are talking of Eastern Europe, but I would enlarge it for the benefit of this House. Sir, about two years ago, a question was put in this very House that in the case of a blacklisted company, called Bofors, from whom we had bought about $ 1.3 billion worth of guns which were very prominent in the Kargil operations, spare parts were being bought from Bofors *via* a middle company called Mipro. This was admitted, and at the committee-level, certain controls were put, but my contention is, Mipro is not the only company. Mipro has only substituted an agent. A middle company has substituted a middleman. There are many companies which have been blacklisted -- HDW from where we got submarines, and there is a company called Marlo with whom we deal. There are many others. Although the hon. Minister has a lot of experience with trade unions and politics, in some areas like business, I think, I have a little more experience. It is my contention, Sir, that a lot of these companies from where we have to buy spare parts, we know that we cannot do without them. Initially, a blacklist took place, but it was continued for 15 years. Intentionally, middle companies have been put in place. The reason is, if an agent is there, he will, probably, earn two to five per cent. But, you can pay the middle companies five per cent premium on what you buy. If something costs you ten dollars, you pay him 500 dollars. There is no check. You open an LC in the name of a middle company. He goes to HDW, or, he goes to Bofors, buys from them, not even buys, he just opens an LC and it is shipped directly by that company, and we have a deal. It is being continued primarily because it helps every one. This is my submission. I know that under pressure, from some of us, people like us, the blacklisting of Bofors was removed. My submission and recommendation

to the hon. Minister is, please get rid of all these blacklists. It is a game which is going on. Deal with them directly, if you have not been able to indigenise those spare parts. If you have to buy from them, deal with them. In the case of Bofors, Sir, the surprising thing is, many years ago, it ceased to be a private company. It was acquired by the Government of Sweden, and yet, we decided to buy through Mipro and other middle companies, instead of dealing directly on government-to-government basis. I think, someone must be answerable for this. Someone must give us the answer. Why are we sensitive about dealing directly with the Government of Sweden, and we deal through middle companies, where we have been paying inflated prices, and we may get sub-standard products? Someone has to answer these questions. Sir, this is about Mipro. Therefore, I recommend that all these blacklists must be removed.

There is another issue which I must raise. Probably, it is a little sensitive because it has been openly discussed in the Press, but I have got all the documents. Even in the private sector, when we are dealing in major contracts, we don't allow our executives to go and stay and enjoy the hospitality of the supplier. It is understood that this kind of a game is not allowed, and yet, Sir, a senior officer, a very senior officer of one of our defence establishments goes to Eastern Europe, goes to London, travels all over for a month or six weeks.

In his leave application, which I have here -- if the hon. Minister wants, I can give it -- he says, 'I am going to stay in small hotels in London and I will stay with my cousin in Manchester. This will cost me Rs.20,000.' However, it was accepted. In Rs.20,000! I defy anyone to live in a city like Delhi. He travelled all over, staying in hotels. How can you live there in Rs.20,000? Sir, he did not stay in hotels; he stayed as a guest of two prominent arms dealers. He was entertained by them. All his expenses and everything was taken care of by those people. He came back and is promoted. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will give the name but I must have the nod. He was promoted to the highest or the second highest position in his service.

I will give you a parallel example now. ...*(Interruptions)*... Government is a Government. This is happening in the defence establishments. I refer to you a case of 12-14 years ago, of the Chairman and Managing Director of the State Bank of India. His two young daughters go to London, stay for a month with one of the bank's clients. When they come

back, the house of this hon. Chairman and Chief Executive of the State Bank is raided. He is dismissed and twelve years down the line, he is still being hounded by the CBI. Why is this difference in the way the Government looks at two senior people? One in the defence force, and the other in a bank. I had raised this hypothetical question. If someone of us goes to Dubai -- he may be from Bombay, Maharashtra -- he would go and enjoy the hospitality of Mr. Dawood Ibrahim, and when found out, he may say, 'After all, he was my class-fellow; so, I stayed with him and enjoyed his hospitality.' My question is, how would the Government view this?

There are three parallel examples. This is stated as one of the charges by a dismissed chief. I think, the influence of these agents is there in terminating the services of an armed forces' chief, who, I know, was interested in indigenisation. That is the kind of a thing happening. That has an impact on national security. When you are continuously depending for spares, for new weapon systems and for everything, on imports, what kind of security do you enjoy? In times of war, these countries will let you down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Please conclude now.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Sir, I have to complete this. ...*(Interruptions)* ...This is a very sensitive thing. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it has taken me two years to initiate this debate. Two years! ...*(Interruptions)* ...Now, there is the question of spares. I have a lot of experience in manufacturing. When we talk of transfer of technology, when we say that we are going to buy a hundred tanks or 50 MiGs, we say that we buy some and the rest would be produced in the country. We will produce them. I do not mean that they will just be assembled. The first stage is assembling and the second stage is to manufacture the critical components of the system. What happens?

We have imported submarines. At Cochin, the CAG raised an objection. The objection was that spares had come there and they had not been examined during the warranty period. The warranty was for 18 months. After the lapse of the 18-month period, they found that it was junk. You cannot get them replaced because the warranty period is over. On being asked, the seniormost officer of that establishment answers, 'Sir, how can we check? We did not have the drawings and we did not have the material

specifications.' This is how purchases are done and, yet, I have letters saying that we have perfect systems and nothing goes out of the system.

My charge is, Sir, you have Rs.30,000 crores and more of excessively bought and wrongly bought things, and junk, lying in your various Army, Air force and Navy depots.

No one had gone and controlled them. My recommendation to the Minister is, you please ask the CAG to investigate whether it is Rs. 30,000 crores or Rs. 40,000 crores. With all these crores lying there, your tanks, your MIGs, and your submarines are not functional because they do not have the spares.

Sir, I will now come to tank spares. T-72 has been with us for 20 years, perhaps, 18 years. Yet, we are dependent on spares not only from Russia, Czechoslovakia, Slovakia, and you name it. The countries which do not produce these tanks we go to them and acquire spares from them. Probably, these traders, with whom we deal, will pick the spares up from some junkyard, paint them and supply to us. There is no joke in it. It is happening because you have imported these tanks. You have the transfer of technology. All your drawings are lying here, in Delhi, in the Russian language, untranslated. Therefore, you are depending on some vague part numbers which keep on changing. Therefore, you do not get anything that you really require. It is very unfortunate. The country is put to a great loss. We get wrong supplies. We get spurious supplies. And, we are paying them at an inflated price. There are charges that we are upgrading our 130 mm guns to 150 mm or 155 mm and we are giving the order to Solton. Whereas, my concern is, we have 39 Ordnance factories. The Ordnance factory in Kanpur have developed prototypes, which has been tested at Balasore. Why are we not giving this work to the Ordnance factory in Kanpur? Why are we going to convert all these Ordnance factories into another NTC scene, where we pay them the wages, we have got all the establishment cost and no work. That, I think, is another area which is affecting our security because if you have a war for 15 days or 20 days or 30 days and if you do not get spares, how the hell are you going to fight? Sir, I will be very brief. I can see that you are concerned about time.

The third aspect is, we have 39 Ordnance factories but we have invested heavily only in four or five factories. Sir, thousands of crores worth of equipment is invested in places like Mazagon dock, where, they say that you can produce submarines. Forget about producing submarines. If we go

there, we come to know that there is no work. They cannot even repair the submarines. Sir, submarines go abroad for repairs. We have an integrated plant to produce submarines. We have the transfer of technology. And, yet, instead of placing the orders with Mazagon dock, we send our submarines back for refill to Russia, etc. Why should we be put up with this huge white elephant if we are not going to give them any work? Then, look at the Avadi Plant. We visited their facilities. We found the same thing. There is hardly any work. I must make a point now, where I again believe that the role of middlemen have done the damage. Eight months ago, the hon. Minister, whom I thank incidently, told me that he had placed orders with Avadi for 124 Arjun tanks which have been under development for 23 years. It may be compared with one of the top 3-4 tanks of the world. But I am sorry to say, and I am sure it will shock the hon. Minister also, that day-before-yesterday I checked up and found that the order with Avadi has still not been placed. Why? Because if they get the order, how will you justify the purchase of T-90?

Now, I come to the matter of T-90 which has been raised here, and where one of our former Prime Ministers has been involved. I have something to say about it. Basically, the T-90 controversy is because this tank has not been in use with the Russian Army. It has not been battle-tested. Someone said that we had bought T-72 tanks also like this. But T-72 tanks had been battle-tested in the Middle-East. But this tank has never been tested. The reason given for buying the T-90 tanks was that Pakistan has acquired T-80 tanks from Ukraine. Sir, it is true. We had also tested those T-80 tanks and found them to be unfit. Therefore, Pakistan has a similar problem like we have. I am not going to get involved in the kickback stories, etc. But they have similar problem. They bought those tanks, and to counter that, justification was being given that we should have T-90s. Our own intelligence reports--whatever I have been told; after all, I don't sit there - say that the T-80 tanks in Pakistan have been found to be substandard. They are not getting spares and the army is very disappointed with them. So, what are we going to do with the T-90s? Mash them in junk? And, Sir, in this regard, I would like to just quote a former Director General of the Armed Forces, in the Armoured Corps, who was also an hon. Member of the Lok Sabha, a Nominated Member, nominated by the BJP. I will just read out what he has to say. He was Lt. General foley. He says, "You are right about this tank, the

T-90. I suspect, it is a T-72S, with an upgraded 1000 hp engine. All other design features remain static with the T-72S. The Russians have jacked up the price. My personal view is that this tank, T-90, must be trial-evaluated with the T-72S upgraded, and you will find surprising commonalities. I had suggested induction of the T-72S after we had conducted detailed evaluation in 1993-94. I assume politics and who should get the deal held up this decision. We should insist that the T-72 upgraded should also be evaluated with the T-90. I believe that the T-90 is the upgraded T-72S. It costs five to six crores of rupees now in its upgraded version presume. In 1994, the cost was Rs. three crores. If we accept the T-72S at Rs. 5-6 crores, we would save Rs. 1500 crores which can be utilized for the Arjun improvement. Our T72 and T72MI can be configured as T-72S when they come to Avadi for overhaul.

The commonality is over 75% between T-90S and T-72S. The T-72S also fires a missile through its barrel." Sir, this is not Jayant Malhoutra or someone from the Congress who is saying this thing. An hon. Member of Parliament, nominated by the B.J.P. who held a high post in as late as 1985 in the Armed Corps of this country, is saying this.

I finally go to one or two more points. Sir, in a country like India, where we claim to produce missiles, and now we are talking of missile ranges of 10,000 kilometres and more, we have shoe factories in Kanpur where the workers have no work, they are just getting salaries, or, staying out because they are not getting salaries or their provident funds. This is the case in many Government establishments. I would like to know as to why these factories in Kanpur have not been given the charge to produce snow-shoes. If we can produce missiles and we claim to produce many other things, but at the same time if we cannot produce shoes, if we cannot produce thermal clothes, if we cannot produce thermal tents, then our soliders in Kargil have to suffer. This is a very important aspect. There are many small, small things that strengthen the nation. We do not have to depend on foreign countries for these small, small things. Our army officers are going and having parties in Switzerland to buy snow-shoes. It is a disgrace. When we get technology, and we say that we are transferring technology, it is not just to produce a system; it is to produce every component there. The unfortunate part is, we trust the Czechs, we trust the Swedes, we trust the Britishers, we trust the Americans, but we will not trust our private sector. We cannot give them drawings because it is a security hazard. But are those countries not security hazards?

Sir, this is what is happening. Mr. Minister, you have a lot of experience in manufacturing, as much as, or perhaps more, from the other side as I have. That is why I think it is tragic. I am not blaming you for the problems that are there because you inherited them. But for what I am blaming you is that you are not correcting them. These problems should have been corrected. These problems should not be there. I would like to know : Why are we placing order for tanks abroad? Why are we getting second and third rate submarines from abroad? Why are we buying these junk aircraft carriers? Is it because they are giving it free? Sir, it will end up costing us billion dollars on their repair. In fact, I must ask the hon. Minister that we must give our poor factories a special fund so that they also have some funds -- like ENRON has educational fund - to educate our people in some form or the other. If this thing is provided to these poor factories, maybe, the order books will improve. Sir, this is a very serious issue, and this is something that cannot be sorted out in just a small discussion of the kind we are having now. There is a pile of documents that we have which I think must be examined in a properly constituted J.P.C. It is not a party matter. It cuts across party-lines. We must have this J.P.C. which will study this and put correction in place because national security is at stake, both in short-term and long-term. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to participate in this discussion on the issue of defence procurement. Let me first congratulate the hon. Member who preceded me for having highlighted what I think is one of the most important issues and that is of national security that this country is concerned with. I believe that when it comes to defence and defence procurement and when issues are raised in respect of procurement work of the Defence Ministry, the Government always responds by saying that this is a very sensitive matter.

The Government says, "Therefore, these issues should not be discussed in public. Nor should vital questions of security be raised." In the recent past, we have made endeavour after endeavour to bring before this House issues of national importance and strategic importance. Unfortunately, those discussions have never borne fruition.

I do not want to talk of party politics here because, I think, as Jayanthiji has rightly said, this is an issue relating to national security. When we talk of defence procurement, we do not talk of just buying equipment and

buying spares. In this country, we must evolve, what is called, a Defence Procurement Policy. You just cannot go out and decide to buy a piece of equipment. What you have to do is first to understand the threat perception that the country is facing. The nature of the equipment that you are going to buy will have a direct relevance to the threat perception of the country defence budgeting and defence procurement processes should be put in the context of the relevant threat perceptions.

Do we discuss that issue? Do we discuss what threat perception is facing our country, where it is coming from and where it will come from ten years from now? If these issues are discussed within the Ministry among a few selected persons, I dare say, we are not going to evolve a rational Defence Procurement Policy. I say this because, a few months ago, the Minister here referred to a neighbouring country and said that that was our number one enemy. Yet, another Minister who is the Leader of the House, in a book titled, "Defending India," at page 270, in paragraph (2), says, and I quote:

> "On the other hand, in the absence of any social, cultural, political or economic commonality or interdependence, a planned policy of 'improving relations' with China could over the time convert into an opiate, consequently persuading us to mortgage the future yet again by illusions about the present. The Chinese strategic culture remains what it has always been, wedded to domination, not so much through occupation of the real or potential adversary's territory as through a psychological subjugation of mind and emasculation of the adversary's response options. India, therefore, needs to pose to itself some unsettling questions. It is in this broad backdrop that we address ourselves a contour map of India's tasks in the coming decade."

Therefore, I dare say that this Government is clear about the threat perception. Yet, what is it doing about this whole issue?

I am referring to a contemporary book on the subject. When we compare China and India and look at the comparative investments in the defence sector, this position emerges. I have here the figures of 1995. The book is called, "China's Military Faces the Future." This is a 1999 publication. James R. Lilley and David L. Shambaugh are the editors of this book. At page 209, there is a reference to the investment in the defence

budget in China. China's military expenditure shown is $63.5 billion, as compared to India's $7.8 billion. I am referring to the year 1995. This figure, of course, as of today, would, in fact, be over $75 billion to $80 billion. This is 2.3 per cent of its GNP and 18.5 per cent of its Central Government expenditure, whereas our expenditure is only 12.7 per cent of our Central Government expenditure. Now, if there is going to be this gap in the investments ofour respective countries, where do we stand in strategic terms? Then, what is our defence procurement policy in that context?

The question now is, can these issues be decided and discussed openly and publicly? The answer is that they should be. And if they are not, then at least there must be a Joint Committee of the two Houses, which should function as a permanent body. It should at least go into the matter, so that there is some broad element of transparency in our defence procurement policy.

Now the nature of war has changed. In times to come, during the 21st century, we are going to have high technology wars. In these high technology wars, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force will have to have integrated operations. I give you an excample. This is in the context of the nuclear doctrine that has been enunciated by the National Security Board. It involves the target concept. It means that the three wings of the defence forces, namely, the Army, the Air Force and the Navy are joingly going to have a role to play. In the context of the nuclear warfare, that role is very significant, because, as you know, with the kind of espionage activity that goes on, you can find out where a country, at least on land, has its defence weapons. So, the role of the Navy becomes even more significant. Therefore, if you are going to have a war in the future, and if you are going to have a defence procurement policy in the context of the 21st century, then you have to have sea-bed launch missiles. As far as your airfields are concerned, on first strike they will be destoryed. Your technology is not sophisticated enough. I do not want to go into the details, becuase that will take more time. But, technology and missiles are not small and mobile enough to be hidden somewhere so that they cannot be detected. Therefore, the only choice for the future is with reference to developing missiles in submarines, so that you can launch them by sea-bed submarines. Now, what is your policy and what are you going to do about it. These are some of the issues that you will have to look at with reference to the 21st century. That means, you will have to have highly mobile operations. They have to be

concentrated operations. The targets will have to be hard targets, and not soft targets. You know, when in Kosovo the Chinese Embassy was attacked, the USsaid it was by mistake. But, they had to pay compensation to the Chinese, because in modern wars, the international community is not going to accept your having attacked the civilian population. So, your defence procurement policy will have to be with reference to the kind of targets that you want to attack. Do our defence services have any policy at all? The answer is 'no'. The issue of nuclear doctrine has not even gone to the National Security Council. In fact, I think, other than the one initial meeting, the National Security Council did not meet thereafter. So, what is our defence posture?

Then, you are going to have electronic and information warfare. Are we prepared for that? What is our procurement policy with reference to that? Then you have to have fast pace and short duration wars, strategic and tactical mobility, emergency support forces, battlefield repair and support and advance stockpiling of war materials. Do we have a policy on that?

I am afraid, we don't. I am not talking politics here. We are talking about the security of this country. I know very well, you may stand up and say, "What did you do about it when you were in power?" The question is that we have not been in power for some years. You have been in power for two years. What is it that you have done? Other than fighting, making public scenes about personal grievances, other than that, what has happened in the Defence Ministry? I will just give one small example of the kind of situation that we are in. You know of this controversy of the advanced jet trainer. This is something that has been going on for several years now. Now, as far as the advanced jet trainer is concerned, it is necessary, it is fundamental and it is required for the stage three training of our pilots. Recently -- in fact, today or yesterday -- there was a report in the "Hindu" saying that the Ministry of Defence has, in fact, shortlisted two advanced jet trainers. One is the British Hawk ; and the other is the Franco-German Alpha jet. Now, Sir, may I just tell you that the technology of these two advanced jet trainers was developed some 25 years ago? ..(Interruptions)... Since 1986, Alpha jet is not even in production. I was going to say that. Now, they have shortlisted these two. The Standing Committee on Defence said, "No, we should buy the MIG-80?" Why should we buy the MIG-80? Because it is a generation ahead of the Hawk and the Alpha jets. It has a reprogrameable cockpit which can, in fact, train pilots to fire from the MIG-29, SU-30s, Mirage-2000, the Euro fighter

and the US F-15s to F-18s. If you buy MIG-80, you have these additional support systems. But, unfortunately, the MIG-80 has not even been considered, it has not even been shortlisted. The first proposal for the advanced jet trainer, as you all know, was, in fact, placed in 1982. So, from 1982 to 1999, 17 long years have passed, but we have not yet decided which advanced jet trainer we are going to buy. That is our great defence procurement policy! In fact, the Russians have offered the MIG-80 at a cost of Rs.2,000 crores. While we have been negotiating all these and talking about it, the Germans have come up with an even more advanced version of thejet trainer. I am just giving the example of an advanced jet trainer to tell the hon. Members as to where we stand and the pathetic nature of the functioning of this Ministry. Now, the Germans have developed, what is called, 82,000 version jet which is 40 years ahead of the Hawk design, 40 years ahead of the Hawk. It has a stealth technology. It has a great manoeuverability. It has a thrust vectoring engine. What is thrust vectoring engine? All that it means is that jet streams can be directed in different directions so that there is a greater manoeuverability of the aircraft. Now, this particular 82,000 version jet is going to be ready by the year 2000 and can be delivered in 2002; and, yet, I read in the newspapers that what has been shortlisted is the Hawk and the Franco-German Alpha jets. If that is the stage of defence preparedness, then, I am sorry to say that our national security is not quite as we would like it to be.

Having said that, let me come to another example of the Light Combat Aircraft.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE) in the Chair]

Now, to develop a Light Combat Aircraft, it has taken 14 long years of research. Originally, we thought that we might be able to induct it in the year 1990. But, unfortunately, now, the test flight is fixed at some time of the last quarter. It was fixed in 1999. But that too has passed and obviously, we won't have a Light Combat Aircraft. In fact, by the year 2005, we ought to have had a Light Combat Aircraft in service. But what is happening is that the Air Force itself has questioned the operational capability of the Light Combat Aircraft. It is very interesting, Madam Vice-Chairman, that it is supposed to be a Light Combat Aircraft, but the Defence Services say, the Air Force says, that it is, in fact, a thousand kilogram heavier than it should be. To state the exact amount, it is about 6000 kilograms heavier than it should be. And it is

supposed to be a Light Combat Aircraft! That, in fact, is the opinion of the Aeronautical Development Agency.

Secondly, they have questioned the operational capability of this particular Light Combat Aircraft that is sought to be manufactured. The CAG itself has made some very adverse comments with respect to that. The cost of this Light Combat Aircraft indigenously manufactured would have been Rs.85 crores. And we have been trying to do it for the last 14 years. But, today, we can buy a SU-30 which serves the same purpose at a cost of Rs.130 crores. We need not have waited for 14 long years to invest Rs.85 crores for the manufacture of a Light Combat Aircraft, when we could have bought a SU-30 for Rs.130 crores, or a Mirage-2000. We already have the MiG-29. *(Interruption)*... The SU-30 is now in the offing. That is the problem. We do not have a policy which caters to our defence needs. I just gave two examples.

Talking of submarines, Madam Vice-Chairman, Pakistan recently acquired the Agosta and now, of course, the moment Pakistan acquires something, we start looking for it. That is the point I raised in the beginning because the policy of defence procurement just does not mean that you go out into the market and buy a weapon. You have to have a strategic policy for it. In 1996, the Navy planned and sent a revival scheme of the indigenous line of development with respect to submarines. And Admiral Bhagwat was responsible for that. Of course, that scheme was sidelined. The result of it is, today, we had a force level of 26 submarines; and we do not have 26 submarines any more; because six of them have become outdated; there are only 12 left; eight are Russian Kilo class submarines and four are HDWs; and we do not have an indigenous project. The Indian submarines have to snorkel once in every 24 hours for recharging their batteries. In other words, the most modern submarines do not have to come to the surface. But these Indian submarines that we have have snorkel, that is, they have to come to the surface every 24 hours. So, what do we have to do? Naturally, in this situation, if we do not have a defence posture, if we do not have a policy, we have to go out into the open market and buy it. If somebody suggests indigenise the programme or development of a submarine, we do not talk about it. This is exactly what Malhoutraji was pointing out. When you go out into the market, what happens? Naturally, there are vultures out there who want to participate in the booty. Who else participates in the booty is something that can be found out only on an inquiry. The Mazagon Docks are

having nothing and the labour is lying idle. In fact, the Minister, in reply to a question the other day in this House, has said that only when there is work at the Mazagon Docks, we take work from them; otherwise, they just are idle there. We do not develop our indigenous programmes. We go out into the market and have to buy in an emergency, make spot purchases at exorbitant prices, whether from South Africa or any other country.

Who gets what in the bargain, god alone knows, and we do not have a defence programme policy. Now recently, the Pakistanis acquired a P-3C maritime patrol-cum-strike aircraft from the United States of America, and we have to acquire an early warning system to find out that an aircraft is approaching us, because when an aircraft is approaching us, we must have the technical capacity of finding out in time that it is going to approach us. For that we require an airborne early warning system. We do not have it. We want to acquire it from the Russians. But we do not have it in place. Now, in this situation, if you want to acquire such a system from either Russia or the United States of America or Britain or France or whoever, and you go to them in an emergency situation, if you do not have any long-term planning, they are going to extract the price that they want. You won't be able to say no to it because you have to answer the public opinion. If we did not have spares when the Kargil war took place, immediately after the war, we had to respond to the public opinion. Why were our troops handicapped in this fashion, up in Kargil, where they did not have snow boots, where they did not have the requisite spares for the Bofors gun? Therefore, after you came back to power, you went out to enter into a contract so that you can tell the world at large that you are doing something about it. Now, this is not the way to conduct the functioning of the Defence Ministry, this is not the way to conduct any policy arrangement in respect of defence purchases.

Having said that, let me come to the Army. That is another interesting story. As far as the Army is concerned, we very much need, what is called a smursh, a multiple rocket launcher, which is absolutely necessary. We do not have it, and the smursh can be acquired by us. Why did we not acquire it in the past? It is because we were wanting to develop an indigenous multiple rocket launcher and an indigenous multiple rocket launching system, and that is called the Pinaka. I will read out to you the latest report of the C.A.G. in respect of the Pinaka-- Year ended March, 1999--Development of Multi-barrel Rocket Launcher System-- page (v). It says:

"Multi-barrel rocket launcher system, Pinaka, is a weapon for destroying, neutralising enemy troop concentration areas, communication centres and for laying mines by firing rockets from several warheads. The Ministry had sanctioned competence build up project for the Pinaka in early 80's. With the plan to induct regiments, equipped with this modern artillery warfare system from 1994. As of 1998, the DRDO is nowhere near accomplishing this target. The warheads and all the three vehicles necessary for launching the rocket, namely, the launch replenishment and command post vehicles were yet to be developed even after eleven years of sanction by the Ministry. Against the requirement of eight types of warheads for the rockets only, three have been developed. One is not acceptable to the Army and the other is only a dummy. The development and selection of the launcher vehicle is yet to be completed. The vehicle required to load and replenish two salvos within 45 minutes and the launcher needed up to forty minutes to load one salvo. Forty minutes to load one salvo! The development of command post vehicle is also being delayed due to selection of a chassis which failed to match the mobility of the launcher."

This was in 1998. We started this project in the 80's. That is the state of your defence services, and now, of course, you have got to go to the Russians because you want the 'smursh,' and that is a rocket launcher. If we had it, if we had purchased it in advance, then the war in Kargil would have ended months in advance. Because it has a physical effect and it has a psychological effect. It has tremendous mobility. My learned colleague spoke about the upgradation of the T- 72s. What happened to that? Instead of upgrading it, you bought the T-90s. I believe, tests were conducted of the T-90s in the Rajasthan desert, and one of the tanks proved to be a failure. The Minister would know about it. And, of course, there is the Arjun. What has happened to that project? Madam Chairperson, the issue that I raise today is that this Government has no defence posture, it has no defence policy worth the name. It has no defence procurement policy at all. It is purchasing these items in an *ad hoc* fashion and is employing the same system that was employed by the previous Governments. I think the time has come when there must be a greater transparency in the acquisition of weapon systems in this country. The time has come when these must be done within a policy

framework. It must be discussed and must be debated upon, not necessarily publicly, -- due to certain secret systems, -- but certainly within the four walls of this House; and if not that, then, within the domain of a Committee which is set up for this purpose. If we don't do that, then, our security will be in danger. If we don't do that, then the one thing for which we went ahead with our tests on May 11th and 13th, namely, to protect our security, would not be fulfilled. Madam, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (DELHI): Madam Chairperson, we were scheduled to discuss the subject of external affairs yesterday. And today, we were scheduled to discuss the defence procurement policy. I think we are discussing the two subjects after a long time. Actually, I have a feeling that these two subjects are very much related. They are like the two sides of the same coin. There should be an annual joint discussion on defence and diplomacy. You cannot separate the one from the other. You cannot have any diplomacy, if you have no proper defence. And without diplomacy, defence is just false. Our good friends have dealt, at some length, with conventional weaponry. I have had the good fortune of being with Mr. Malhoutra on the Public Accounts Committee and we have gone to many defence establishments. I also had the privilege of being a Member of the Standing Committee on Defence throughout this six-year term. I will not repeat what has already been said. I will add only one small bit of information. We had a meeting with a very senior retired Air-Marshal. Being an old journalist, I have the habit of putting questions. Sir, the issue was about the AJT. Out of curiosity, very innocently, I asked 'What is the AJT used by Russia?' He gave me a name. Next I asked, 'What is the AJT used by China?' He gave me the same answer. Again I asked, 'What is the AJT used by Pakistan?' He gave the same answer. Then I said, ' Why cannot we go in for that same thing?' He had no reply. I did not get any reply from anybody after that. I am not an expert. Our Defence Minister is here. Our hon. External Affairs Minister, who is an expert, is also here. Maybe, they can throw some light on this. But after studying the development of the Arjun tank, the AJT, and the LCA, I got the feeling that the delay is inexplicable, if not intriguing. I am not blaming anybody, neither this Government nor the previous Government. There have been many Governments, but this thing has been going on. All that we need today is to see that it does not go on like that. As I said earlier, defence and diplomacy are interlinked. I am not going

to convince anybody any further. I would like to deal with defence; nuclear defence, nuclear development and nuclear diplomacy. Sir, it was a great day in the history of India, as I see it, when we had the second nuclear test in Pokhran in May, last year. There might be some difference of opinion; I have no quarrel on that. But that thing had put India on the power map of the world. Our country is the land of greatmen like the Buddha and Gandhi. We, the people of this country, always had a moral authority. We have also something of a material, physical and secular authority. We cannot do just like that.

What has been happening since then is not sufficiently clear, at least to me. Right from the beginning, we have been saying that we will not have any further nuclear tests. I do not know. I am not a nuclear scientist, not even a student of nuclear science. Why do we need to say this? Did Pakistan say this? No other country has said it. Why did we say this? Did we consult the military people? Did we consult the scientists? There may be some difference of opinion. The scientists may feel that they have all the information. They are confident that they can produce nuclear weapons. But the military people would like to know whether it actually exists, whether it actually works. Then we said 'no first use'. Nobody wants to use it. God forbid. Why did you say this? Others do not say this. Why did we say this? Why are we afraid of our own shadow? How can we keep quiet? Sir, all honour to this Government, as I said, because it has put India on the nuclear map of the world.' Of late, we have been talking of a consensus on CTBT. All these are related issues. There should be a consensus on all the issues. Consensus is an excellent thing . But the Prime Minister has made his position very clear in India and abroad in the UN. The Prime Minister spoke in the Lok Sabha on 15th December, 1998, and in the UN General Assembly on 24th September, 1998. According Vajpayee's formulation, positive movement by India demands two things. One, the successful conclusion - I quote the word ' successful conclusion - of negotiations with key interlocutors, which means the Big Five. And two, the signature and ratification --I quote --'without conditions' by the other 43 required States under the CTBT's Article 14. And it is an excellent formulation. Has any party disagreed with this formulation? Is there no consensus on this? To the best of my knowledge and belief, there is no difference of opinion. We all want that the whole world recognise India as a nuclear weapon State. What more consensus do we want? Why do we say, if there is a consensus, we will

sign it. Many other things need to be done before we sign it. Recently, an high official of the US said that India should have a minimum deterrent. Not that I or anyone of us here is for a maximum deterrent. It is for us to decide what kind of deterrent we should have. Who are they to define 'minimum' or 'maximum'? Maybe, we need an optimum deterrent. Why should anybody advise us ? Why do we not snub them? I am not referring to anybody. But this is no way of treating a great country like India and telling us as to what we should do or should not do. There is no response from the Government.

Sir, I am very happy that the hon. External Affairs Minister is here. He has had a series of nine talks with his counterpart, Mr. Talbott, in the USA. ... *(Interruptions)*... Don't be literal. That is, the negotiator on the other side. Let us put it that way. Let us not quarrel about that. What exactly is happening, we don't know. I am sure, what is happening must be good. But the country should know. We should have some ideas about what is happening because some other news that is coming from Washington is not very reassuring. Mr. Talbott--it is on record-- has said that U.S.A.refused to accept India's nuclear weapon status, and I quote, "even by implication". If this is their position, what are you negotiating with them? We are all for meetings, nine or ninety. But what is coming out of them? That is important.

A very senior Minister of the Government has said that we should "disaggregate" CTBT. There are three stages, signing, ratifying and depositing. In India's case there is only one stage. There is no provision for ratification. So, why do we put ratification? We know that if, and as and when, the CTBT is signed, it will be deposited. Why do we live in an illusion that it is a long process, signing it doesn't mean nothing and there are two further stages? There are other stages. It has also been said by a very senior Minister of this Government, and I quote, "a nation, as great as India, does not see any kind of *quid pro quo*". *No quid pro quo*! Are you asking for charity? We ask for recognition for what we are. There was a time when the US did not recognise China. Can't China exist? They did not seek recognition by the US. Why are we yielding ground on issue after issue? When you say that there need be no *quid pro quo*, it means that is a one way traffic. Our great Gokhale used to say that there is no charity in politics. There is certainly no charity in international relations. Why shouldn't there be *quid pro quo?* If we do something for them, why can't they do something for us? What is the great idea?

SHRI SURESH PACHOURI (Madhya Pradesh): By the way, who was the Minister? Whom are you referring to?

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: We are not interested in that. We are interested in issues. We are not discussing A, B, C. Mr. Malhoutra did not give you the names. I need not give you the names. It is on record, in any case.

Another very senior Minister--with all respect I salute the entire Vajpayee Government and all his Ministers... *(Interruptions)*... Please have some patience. Hold your soul in peace. *(Interruptions)*... Please understand the situation. We are not individuals. We represent something. If we have certain doubts, certain apprehensions, we should come out with them. If not here, where shall we do it? Shall we do it in Chandni Chowk? Missiles can be based either on land or by air or by sea. Suddenly, unilaterally, an important Indian leader said, "we are giving up the sea option".

Missiles are land-based. Whoever is attacking us canalways hit them. He knows he can hit them. Somebody is moving all the time. We have given up this option that we will not use the sea. Why?

Only three months back, the Government came out with a Nuclear Doctrine. That Nuclear Doctrine provided for a triad-- land, air and sea. How did they knock out one thing? Who did it and why? I am afraid, we in this country are not exactly great negotiators. I am talking in general terms. We do not have much stamina. We do not take a stand. We tend to yield. I will give you just one example. My friends in the Congress Party should not attack me on this. We have to understand the situation. I will just talk about the Chemical Weapon Convention, 1995. How they made fool of our citizens that I will tell you briefly. We had a little chemical weapon. We announced it. Then we signed the Treaty. Now foreign inspectors come and inspect all our sites to see whether we are secretly manufacturing chemical weapons. We have to pay for their coming, going and staying here. Pakistan proved much smarter. Pakistan also had some small chemical weapon. They quietly described it to them and wrote on the file 'nil',. They did not pay anything. They did not do anything. America put twenty conditions before signing this Convention. Why did not we put even one condition? Why? I am not a student of Chemistry or of chemical warfare. But these are elementary things.

I would like to mention one more thing. We have a group of 21

developing countries. We are a part of this group. We had decided that we will not negotiate on fissile material cut-off treaty without prior negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament. Have we kept this stand? Have we deviated from it? Have we started negotiating leaving other 20 countries apart? CTBT is not the last thing. Many other things are happening. CTBT is very unequal. I would like to quote it. It says, "The unequal commitments under the CTBT were laid bare during the US Senate hearings in October, 1999. The hearings revealed what had been known for long, namely that the permanent 5 - 5 nuclear power States have concluded "side agreements" and exchanged a classified documents, Memoranda of Understanding and some letters" to give themselves special rights under the Treaty. One such side agreement is the so called permissible activities accord under which the P-5 States have defined what testing and experimentation is permissible for themselves and themselves alone." Under these Memoranda of Understanding they agreed that only they can carry out alternative high-tech testing and other weapon related experiments under or in spite of the CTBT.

All these five also assured themselves that they five would be on the Executive of the CTBT Committee, and nobody else. The question arises: Why do we have to think of signing the CTBT unless these three matters are clarified? I think, unless and until the original position taken by the Government, taken by our Prime Minister, -- all honour to him -- that India must be recognised as a nuclear weapon State is accepted, there should be no question of discussing the matter with him. Otherwise, we will remain permanently second-class. Talks are very good; negotiations are very good. It is good that Shri Jaswant Singh has been meeting Mr. Talbott. I am sure that there are Secretary-level talks also. But the country, or, at least, the Members of Parliament, should know what is happening. It is possible that you cannot say all these things in public. I know that there is a time for secrecy. But there is also a time for transparency. In all humility, I would suggest that the Government should consider calling a secret Session of Parliament, with a word of affirmation that nothing will go on record. The Members should know what is happening and why. During the war-time, Churchill used to call the House of Commons; not a word used to leak out. So, these are very crucial issues. It is a very crucial stage for us. Information is very necessary. We fought the war with China in 1962. We know what happened. But, till date, the official inquiry report has not been published. I am very surprised why it has not been published. China knows what

happened. The whole world knows what happened. By suppressing this report, by keeping this report unpublished, are you not denying our own people the basic information as to what happened and why? Fortunately, in the last decade, two senior Generals, who were in charge at that time, namely, General Rudra and General Palit, have come out with their memoirs. They make a revealing reading. I am sure the Anderson Group Report, --please don't think that Anderson was an Englishman; he obtained Indian citizenship, and he got commissioned into the Indian Army -- and, General Bhagat, whowas the first recipient of the Victoria Cross... *(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) : The Anderson Group Report has been fully copied in the book written by Neville Maxwell in 60s.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Thank you. My impression is different. I have read that book. It is not the full version. He has only partly mentioned about it. He has used bits and pieces of that report in his book. It is only partial. I would humbly submit to the Government to seriously consider coming out with this Report because it contains nothing that is not known to America and others. It is only a secret to the people of India. That is all I would say. Thank you.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal: I compliment profusely Shri Malkani, my friend, for making an eloquent speech. I believed as if some one from among us was speaking through Shri Malkani. I compliment him profusely. This may be his last speech. We appreciate him. We pay our tribute to him. He has made an excellent speech. He has really laid bare the fallacy of India's policy towards the CTBT.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे) : इसमें कोई शक नहीं है गुरुदास जी, मलकानी जी ने बहुत अच्छे ढंग से , शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से , बड़े खुले दिल से अपने विचार रखे हैं इसलिए हम सभी को उन्हें बधाई देनी चाहिए। आज वह बहुत अच्छा बोले हैं।

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: I would like to join my friend, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, in complimenting my colleague, Shri Malkani, on this issue.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS AND MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIMENTARY AFFAIRS SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: I would like to draw the attention of the Government that this is the last occasion when he would be here in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We want you back.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: We would urge upon the BJP to bring him back to this House. We need persons like him.

PROF. (SHRIMATI) BHARATI RAY (West Bengal): Members never retire from politics.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): You are right. Politicians never retire. लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है कि यह उनकी लास्ट स्पीच है, मलकानी जी को हम लोग काफी मिस करेंगे, इसमें भी कोई शक नहीं है।

SHRI A. VIJAYA RAGHAVAN (Kerala): Madam, three learned speakers in the House have already participated in this discussion and contributed their views on our defence policy. While initiating this discussion, Jayant Malhoutraji had posed some very important questions before us. While we are discussing the defence policy, we all know that defence expenditure is increasing all over the world. USA's share in global defence spending went up from 27% in 1983 to 36.67%. The share of NATO in the global defence expenditure increased from 42% in 1987 to 58.57% in 1996. Nowadays, all these things are a threat in a way. Even the expenditure of our own country has increased by more than 100 per cent in the last decade. We are discussing seriously about the security of the nation. Of course, we have to spend on defence. There is no doubt. But while spending this huge amount, there should be transparency. We should not forget that. Modernisation of our defence needs thousands and thousands of crores of rupees. Recently, we were talking about the withdrawal of the old aircraft carrier and the induction of a new aircraft carrier. I do not want to go into the details of this. But we know that an aircraft carrier means thousands of crores of rupees. I think, it is nearly six thousand crores of rupees. Along with this carrier, we need so many submarines and other vessels. That means, we have to spend about one-third of the total Naval budget on one aircraft carrier. It means, the expenditure is very high. We have to spend nearly seven lakhs of rupees per day on one aircraft carrier. Again, our learned friends talked about Advanced Jet Trainers. We discussed about the limitations of the existing jet trainers and the urgency of developing new jet trainers. We have to spend a minimum of Rs.2,000 crores. All these things need a huge amount. Here, the hon. Member, Jayant Malhoutraji, mentioned about the T-90 tank, its impact and its defects, etc. All other friends supported it. Here also, the expenditure

is very high. We also discussed about the Bofors deal. Jayant Malhoutraji disclosed the names of so many persons in this House. They are all good cousins of politicians in this nation. We have to take note of that. All such transactions should be transparent. There should not be any scope for corruption.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Madam, my senior colleagues have raised so many important issues, and I don't want to repeat them. We have to think over them seriously. There should be a thorough investigation into what happened in the recent years in the purchase of defence material, specially the spare parts, T-90 tanks, etc. I also support the view of Shri Malhoutra that a proper investigation should be done in this regard. I hope, the hon. Minister would agree to our suggestion.

Secondly, Madam, when we are discussing the modernisation of our defence establishments, we should see to it that it is done speedily. There are still bureaucratic controls in the modernisation of defence establishments. Defence is not a department like other departments of the Government. So, if the Government wants to take decisions on advance jet trainer, on research and development and modernisation, then there should not be so much of bureaucratic control on all these issues. Earlier, the Defence Minister told the House that he was going to change the existing pattern of the Defence Ministry. But, still the Service Chiefs are facing the hurdles which have been created by the bureaucrats. It should be avoided. I suggest that there should be reorientation and proper planning in the Defence Ministry, as far as decision-making is concerned. That would be more helpful for our defence establishments.

Thirdly, Madam, we have to discuss about the developments which are taking place inside our defence establishments. Here, I am not talking about big, big programmes. What is the situation even of small programmes? Our soldiers are using simple weapons like LMG, 7.62 mm rifles, 9 mm carbine, etc. There is a proposal that there should be a common ammunition for all these weapons. Though it is a very small thing, it would help the country a lot. It would decrease our defence expenditure. In addition to saving the money, it has other advantages also. Unfortunately, even in this programme, the Defence Ministry is lagging far behind.

Madam, after the Kargil war, there was a move to modernise our defence establishments. There was a talk of purchasing bullet-proof jackets,

night mission devices, mine detectors, etc. Here, I would like to say that while we are moving towards modernisation of our defence establishments, we should be transparent in our deals. There is an allegation that we bought from South Africa anti-mine vehicles which were 20 years old, refurbished and repainted. What was the reply given in Parliament? They said that it was cheaper than the one which was supplied by the US. But the point is, it was refurbished and repainted. In a hurry to buy these things, we should not forget as to what would be its consequences. If they buy things in a hurry, then there is a possibility of corruption. So, we should not be in a hurry to buy these equipment for modernisation of our defence establishments. We should keep in mind the quality of these equipment which we are going to induct in our defence arsenal.

We must seriously think about indigenisation of the armed forces. All my learned friends expressed their concern about submarines. What would happen to the situation IN our country? Within ten years, Madam, forty per cent of our submarines will become obselete. They will not be in the arsenal. Naturally, we need to have the latest, advanced, submarines.

Our learned Kapil Sibalji explained the status of our existing submarines and the difference between our submarines and the submarines acquired by Pakistan. While we discuss about this thing, we have to think about building our own submarines. We have all the facilities at the Cochin Dockyard, we have facilities at Vishakhapatnam, we have facilities at Calcutta and Bombay. We do not have that much foreign exchange. So, naturally, we must discuss about indigenous production.

I hope, while replying to this debate, the hon. Defence Minister would inform us about the problems faced by us and, I hope, he would also assure us that he is chasing away those problems, with indigenous production.

I have some other issues to mention. While we are discussing the defence policy, we should note that we have sufficient infrastructure and we have sufficient investments made on this. There are thirty-nine ordnance factories! Is it a small thing? Thousands and thousands of crores of rupees have been, invested. It has a long history, right from the British period. Are we utilising it properly? Would there be a proper modernisation programme for our ordnance factories? The hon. Defence Minister should explain to the House as to what his programme of modernisation is. How are we going to utilise the capacity of the existing ordnance factories to the maximum? We have spent thousands and thousands of crores of rupees on this.

I have some experience about the ordnance factory in Jabalpur, Madam Deputy Chairman. My experience shows that we have the capacity to make 300 vehicles per month from that ordnance factory.

Our Defence Ministry is not placing sufficient orders to that particular factory. There we have the trained labour and we need vehicles. What is the approach of the Defence Ministry? Madam, last year, they had placed order, for three types of vehicles, with Telco and Ashok Leyland. For all these three types of vehicles, they had placed the order only with Telco and Ashok Leyland. We have the necessary facilities in our defence factory. But, the Ministry did not place orders with it. It is unanswered. We have spent crores of rupees by placing orders with Telco and Ashok Leyland. As a result, our workers in the factory did not get sufficient work. Here, the point is, they did not supply the vehicles in time. Madam, it has happened. We have indigenous capacity to produce 300 vehicles per month. So, why did they place the order for procuring 1000 vehicles with them? In spite of the placing order with them, they did not supply us the vehicles in the stipulated time. They supplied the vehicles very slowly. In the first instance, they had supplied 200 vehicles, then they supplied 100 vehicles, then they supplied another 50 vehicles. They supplied like this. Why did we not utilize our capacity? That is the question to be answered...(time-bell)...Madam, only one issue is to be added to that. There is a MoU between the Ministry of Defence and Telco and Ashok Leyland with regard to using of machines of Telco and Ashok Leyland in our factory. What is the situation? Now, we need the ISO 9002 Certificate for the machines. That process is going on in our Ordnance factory. Telco and Ashok Leyland supply the machines to our Ordnance factory. Inside, they are using our own vehicles. Does it have that capacity? No. After two years, it becomes redundant. Why? Why is the Ministry of Defence doing such kind of things? What is the reason behind this? That is to be answered. This shows that we are not properly utilizing our indigenously available infrastructure. We are not utilizing our vehicle factories and Ordnance factories optimally. And, whatever orders we are placing with others, is a burden on the nation. So, why should the nation lose this much of amount? After two or three years, we are losing money. We have to change the machinery. Why had the Ministry of Defence placed such an order with them? Why did the Ministry of Defence sign such a kind of MoU with these two companies? That issue should also be addressed. While concluding, I would, once again, request the hon. Minister to have a thorough

investigation with regard to the deals which have been taken place in the immediate past, and to utilize our existing Ordnance factories for the improvement and modernization of our defence force. Thank you.

प्रो० रामगोपाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : थैंक्यू मैडम।

यह जो प्रश्न चर्चा में है इस पर मैं तीन हिस्सों में बात करूंगा। एक आजादी से १९६२ तक, चीन के हमले तक। दूसरा १९६२ से बोफोर्स स्कैंडल के सामने आने तक और तीसरा बोफोर्स के बाद से लेकर अब तक। सब जानते हैं कि प्रारंभ में सारी दुनिया में दो तरह की विचारधाराएं थीं हथियारों की दौड़ को लेकर। एक वह पक्ष था जो डिसआर्मामेंट के पक्ष में था और यह चाहता था कि हथियारों पर जो पैसा खर्च होता है वह हथियारों की दौड़ में न खर्च हो बल्कि जो भूखे लोग हैं, पीड़ित लोग हैं, दुखी लोग हैं उनके रिहैबिलीटेशन में, उनके स्वास्थ्य के लिए, उनके जीवनयापन के लिए खर्च हो। संभवतः इसी विचारधारा को लीड करते हुए हमारे नेतृत्व ने प्रारंभ में कुछ इस तरह की बात की और डिफेंस की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं दिया। लेकिन जब चीन ने हमला किया, तब हमको अहसास हुआ कि देश की रक्षा के लिए, राष्ट्रहित के लिए हथियारों की भी आवश्यकता है, बल्कि और चीजों से ज्यादा आवश्यकता है। इसलिए इसके बाद कोशिश की गयी कि देश की सेनाएं आधुनिकतम हथियारों से लेस हों। यह प्रक्रिया चलती रही।

१९७१ में तत्कालीन पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के बंगलादेश के रूप में उदय होने के बाद पाकिस्तान में हिंदुस्तान से बदला लेने के लिए हथियारों का प्रोक्योरमेट और हिंदुस्तान से आगे निकलने की जो भूख जागृत हुई, वह बहुत तेज थी। सौभाग्य से या दुर्भाग्य से जब बोफोर्स की बात सामने आई, हालांकि आप सब जानते हैं, हम सब जानते हैं कि बोफोर्स के स्कैंडल से ज्यादा बड़े-बड़े जाने कितने स्कैंडल इस देश में उसके बाद हुए लेकिन बोफोर्स का एक ऐसा स्कैंडल था जिसके चलते देश की जनता ने एक सरकार को अपदस्थ किया, दूसरी सरकार को दिल्ली में सत्तारूढ़ किया। लेकिन उसके बाद से लेकर लगभग ८-१० साल तक लोगों के मन में - चाहे वे इस दौरान के प्रधान मंत्री रहे हों या रक्षा मंत्री रहे हों या सेना के अधिकारी रहे हों - उनके मन में एक भय व्याप्त हो गया कि अगर देश की सेनाओं के लिए कुछ हथियारों की खरीद फरोख्त की जाएगी तो दलाली का आरोप लग सकता है। इस भय ने देश के हित को गौण बना दिया। अपनी व्यक्तिगत सुरक्षा को ऊपर रख दिया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि १९८६ के बाद से लेकर अगले १० वर्ष तक इस देश की सेनाओं को ताकत पहुंचाने के लिए अत्याधुनिक किस्म के - चाहे वह एयर फोर्स हो, नेवी हो या आर्मी हो - हथियारों से सुसज्जित करने के लिए कोई प्रभावी कदम नहीं उठाय गया।

मैं यहां माननीय सदस्यों से कहना चाहूंगा कि यह बात दूसरी है कि बोफोर्स सौदे में किस ने दलाली ली, लेकिन उस वक्त ऐसा प्रचार किया गया था । हम लोगों ने भी प्रचार किया - इलाहबाद के चुनाव से लेकर हर जगह बोफोर्स तोप बनाकर कहा कि इस में तो बाजरा निकलता है, इस की रेंज कम है, इस का गोला नहीं जाता है, और इस से हिंदुस्तान की जनता और सेना का मनोबल टूटा । फिर कारगिल में वही बोफोर्स तोप निर्णायक साबित हुई । महोदया, वही अकेली तोप थी जिस का गोला कारगिल हिल के दूसरी तरफ दुश्मन के ऊपर जाकर गिरता था और हमारी पहले की तोपों का जो एलिवेशन था, वह एंगल वह पार नहीं कर सकता था । तो हमें इन सब बातों का ध्यान रखना होगा । वैसे मैं यहां यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि जो व्यक्ति रिवॉल्वर की बैरल को खोलकर उस में कारतूस नहीं डाल सकता, वह तय नहीं कर सकता कि टैंक कौन सा अच्छा होगा, फाइटर प्लेन कौन सा अच्छा होगा या कौन सी सब-मैरिन अच्छी होगी ? It should be decided by Generals. It should be decided by the expert officers. और हमें हर वक्त ऑफिसर के ऊपर संदेह नहीं करना चाहिए । महोदया, सारी दुनिया जानती है कि जब कोई युद्ध होता है और स्क्वाड्रिन लीडर या और कोई ऑफिसर फाइटर प्लेन लेकर दुश्मन के ऊपर बमबारी करने के लिए उड़ता है तो वह यह सोचकर नहीं जाता कि वापिस आएगा । उन की देशभक्ति पर शंका नहीं होनी चाहिए और जो वह हथियार खरीदेगा, वह सब-स्टेंडर्ड होगा, इस तरह की आशंकाएं जनरल पब्लिक में नहीं जानी चाहिए । महोदया, जो लोग मामूली सी तनख्वाह पर हंसते-हंसते अपना जीवन सीमा पर बलिदान कर देते हैं, वे अगर डिमॉरलाइज हो गए तो आप यहां भाषण करते रहिए या डिफेंस पर चर्चा करते रहिए, इस से देश का कोई काम बनने वाला नहीं है । फिर जैसा मल्होत्रा जी ने कहा कि अगर यह बात सच है तो इस की जांच होनी चाहिए कि ३० हजार करोड़ रुपए का एक्सेस सामान ऐसा आया जिस का कभी कोई उपयोग नहीं हुआ और जो जंक है, It should be scrutinized. इस की जांच होनी चाहिए, लेकिन कई ऐसे मसले हैं और हम यह तय नहीं कर सकते हैं। आप कहें कि हम कमेटी बनाकर तय करें कि फलां चीज खरीदी जाए, तो वह कभी नहीं हो सकता है और जब आप को जरूरत पड़ेगी दुश्मन का मुकाबला करने के लिए तो जब वे अंदर आ जाएंगे तो आप तय कर रहे होंगे कि यह चीज खरीदी जाए या यह चीज नहीं खरीदी जाए । हां, ट्रांसपेरेंसी होनी चाहिए । सेना के लिए कौन से साज-सामान की जरूरत है, मिलिटरी के लिए क्या जरूरत है, एअर फोर्स के लिए क्या जरूरत है, अधिकारियों ने क्या डिमांड की डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री से और डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री का कोई मामूली जॉइंट सेक्रेटरी उस फाइल को कितने दिनों तक दबाए बैठा रहा, यह जांच होनी चाहिए। इस के लिए कोई डिफेंस की कमेटी होनी चाहिए,

स्टेंडिंग कमेटी होनी चाहिए, एडवाइजरी कमेटी होनी चाहिए और उस के सामने ये सारी चीजें आ सकती हैं, लेकिन क्या चीज खरीदी जाए, क्या चीज नहीं खरीदी जाए - खरीद से पहले इस से संबंधित कमेटी को, एक्सपर्ट कमेटी को देखना चाहिए ।

हां, एक बहुत गंभीर मसला है कि कई सेना के अधिकारियों ने किताबें भी लिखी हैं। उस में एक बहुत गंभीर मसला है कि एक मेजर जनरल से लेफ्टीनेंट जनरल प्रमोट होता है और १०-१० जनरल्स की टीम उसे सलेक्ट कर के भेज देती है, लेकिन मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ डिफेंस का कोई क्लर्क उस पर एतराज कर देता है तो फाइल टर्न-डाउन हो जाती है । ऐसे डिफेंस एक्सपर्ट्स की - चाहे वह ऑफिसर्स एअर फोर्स के हों, आर्मी के हों या नेवल के हों, उन ऑफिसर्स की देश और परिस्थितियों को **देखते हुए** उन की राय को ध्यान में रखना जरूरी है। ऐसी बहुत सी चीजें हैं जिन की ओर अगर माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी देखें तो बहुत सारी समस्याएं हल हो सकती हैं।

महोदया, आज सीमाओं पर हमारे रिश्ते पड़ौसियों से कैसे हैं, यह सारी दुनिया जानती है। लेकिन चाहे पाकिस्तान हो या चीन हो स्ट्रेटेजिकली जॉर्ज साहब को वह बात कभी नहीं कहना चाहिए थी, जो उन्होंने कह दी और जिस से बड़ा बवंडर मचा। लेकिन यह बात सत्य थी और इसे सारे लोग मन से जानते हैं मगर वह कहना नहीं चाहते कि हमें किन से खतरा है, किन से नहीं। उस खतरे को ध्यान में रखकर यह बहुत ही डिस्गस्टिंग और डिसअपॉन्टिग है जैसा कि कपिल सिब्बल साहब ने कहा कि मल्टी-बैरल लांचर पिनाका के संबंध में सी०ए०जी० की रिपोर्ट के बारे में बताया। अगर वह सच है और अर्जुन टेंक इतने दिनों से तैयार नहीं हो पा रहा है । It is really disappointing, disheartening, and disgusting. We will have to do something.

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं कोई बहुत एक्सपर्ट नहीं हूं, मैं तो जो कॉमन व्यक्ति की परसेप्शन है, उसकी दृष्टि से यह बात कह रहा हूं । टी-७२, टी-९० क्या है, जो आरोप लगाए गए हैं, जो बातें यहां कही गई हैं, वह अगर सच हैं तो मिलिटरी के आफीसर आपके कांपीटेंट हैं, माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी उनसे यह चीजें जान सकते हैं । बहुत सारी बातें मैं जानता हूं, इतना काम होता है, एक पार्टी के लीडर होने के नाते इनकी अलग जिम्मेदारी होती है, डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर होने के नाते अलग जिम्मेदारी हो सकती है, इतना वक्त शायद न हो सकता हो कि सारी जानकारी आपकी जानकारी में आए। इस सदन में सम्मानित सदस्यों के जरिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण तथ्य सामने लाए गए हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि उन पर किसी न किसी एजेन्सी के जरिए, जिसमें संसद सदस्यों को भी कांफीडेन्स में लिया जाए, उन पर कहीं इस तरह की चर्चा, चाहे वह कैमरे के अंदर हो, कोई ऐसी चर्चा होनी चाहिए, जिससे इस पर रोक लगाई जा सके। बढ़िया किस्म के हथियार जो कभी युद्ध के दौरान हमारे सिपाहियों को,

हमारे अधिकारियों को धोखा न दें, बढ़िया किस्म के फाइटर प्लेन और सब-मैरीन जो भी आवश्यक हों, जिसकी आवश्यकता देश को है, उनको प्रोक्योर किया जाना चाहिए।

महोदया, यहां आम लोगों में यह चर्चा है, जब सन १९८६ से लेकर ८-१० साल तक इस देश में कुछ भी नहीं खरीदा गया तो जो पाकिस्तान की युद्ध की प्रिपेयरनेस थी और उससे हिन्दुस्तान एक या दो साल पीछे रह गया था, सारी जनता जानती है कि पाकिस्तान को यह अहसास हो गया कि उसकी तैयारी है और ताकत में वह हिन्दुतान से बेहतर है, जबकि वह कमजोर था, तो उसने सेना भेज दी, चाहे आप उसे घुसपैठिए कहें, लेकिन वह सेना थी । जिस दिन वह ताकतवर हो जाएगा तो उस दिन वह कोशिश करेगा कि दिल्ली की तरफ मार्च करे । इसलिए आपको और सदन के माननीय सदस्यों को जो कहते यह हैं कि इतना कम खर्च हो रहा है या इतना खर्च क्यों हो रहा है, इस पर विचार करना पड़ेगा। जब सेना पर खर्च करना पड़ेगा तो आपको और खर्चो में कटौती करनी पड़ेगी । उस कष्ट को झेलने के लिए लोगों को तैयार रहना होगा, अगर आप देश को सुरक्षित रखना चाहते हैं, देश को सम्मान के साथ जीने की स्थिति में लाना चाहते हैं।

महोदया, अन्त में, जनरल वाशिंगटन का एक ही सेंटेन्स कोट करते हुए मैं अपनी बात खतम करुंगा । जनरल वाशिंगटन ने एक बार कहा था - "To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace."

श्री नागेन्द्र नाथ ओझा (बिहार) उपसभापति महोदया, पहले तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश की जनता को हमारी डिफेन्स फोर्सेस पर नाज है और क्या ही अच्छी बात होगी अगर हमारे देश की जनता अपनी डिफेन्स मिनिस्टरी पर भी नाज करे और हम समझते हैं कि तब यह देश के हित में बहुत बेहतर होगा । हम यह भी मानते हैं कि आगे भी हमारे देश की जनता डिफेन्स फोर्सेस पर नाज करेगी, ऐसा कोई कारण नहीं है कि वह आगे नाज न करे । उसकी कुर्बानियों, देश के जनतंत्र के प्रति उसकी आस्था को देखते हुए हमारे देश की जनता का पूरा विश्वास डिफेन्स फोर्सेस पर है, लेकिन डिफेन्स मिनिस्टरी पर, उसके कार्यो पर, उसकी कार्य-प्रणाली पर उंगुली उठती रही है ।

महोदया, हमारे देश में जबसे भ्रष्टाचार की बात चर्चा में है, जब यह बातें शुरू में हुई तो शुरू में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के तीन-चार ऐसे डिपार्टमेंट थे, जिन पर जनता गर्व करती थी और कहती थी कि भले सब जगह भ्रष्टाचार हो, लेकिन अमुक अमुक विभाग में भ्रष्टाचार नहीं है । उसमें से एक अव्वल नंबर पर हमारी डिफेन्स मिनिस्टरी का नाम आता था कि यहां भ्रष्टाचार नहीं है । धीरे धीरे हमारे पोस्टल डिपार्टमेंट उस चर्चा में आ गया, लेकिन डिफेन्स मिनिस्टरी पर उंगली नहीं उठती थी और देश निश्चिन्त था कि हमारा डिफेन्स इससे बचा हुआ है, इसलिए देश बच जाएगा ।

लेकिन हाल के वर्षों में जो ऐसे घोटाले चर्चित हुए, वे चाहे डिफेंस से संबंधित हों बोफोर्स का घोटाला, पनडुब्बी का घोटाला और कई मामले प्रकाश में आए, तब से हम यह निश्चय ही कह सकते हैं कि हमारी फोर्सिस पर तो अंगुली नहीं उठी लेकिन डिफेंस की पालिसी बनाने वालों पर, डिफेंस के लिए हथियार खरीदने वालों पर, डिफेंस मामले चलाने वालों पर बेशक अंगुली उठी है और हम समझते हैं कि यह देश के लिए खतरनाक बात है। यह कहा जाता है कि कुछ मामले ऐसे होते हैं जिनको डिस्क्लोज़ करने पर नुकसान होगा क्योंकि ये संवेदनशील मामले हैं। बेशक संवेदनशील मामले हैं लेकिन अगर वे हमारे देश की सुरक्षा से जुड़े हों, उन मामलों के चलते रहने से देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा पैदा होता हो, तो यह भी सच है कि देश की सुरक्षा के साथ कोई समझौता नहीं हो सकता, देश की सुरक्षा के साथ समझौता करना खतरनाक होगा । इसलिए संवेदनशीलता के नाम पर किसी मामले को हम प्रकाश में न लाएं, देश की जनता के सामने न रखें, तो हकीकत में हम देश की सुरक्षा को खतरे में डालते हैं और ऐसा नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। इसलिए सर्वप्रथम कामरेड मलकानी जी की भावना का मैं समर्थन करता हूं, जो उन्होंने कहा है कि कुछ भी न हो तो सीक्रेट सिटिंग हो जाए, सारी बातों पर डिस्कशन हो, मैं उनकी इस बात का तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूं। अगर यह भी करने में आप अक्षम हैं तो जो हमारे प्रथम वक्ता थे, मल्होत्रा जी, और जो मामले उन्होंने उठाए हैं, वे काफी गंभीर हैं, वे मामले ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी को सौंप दीजिए, उन मामलों पर वह ध्यान दे, अपने कन्क्लूज़न पर जाए और रिकमेंडेशन दे। पार्लियामेंट के मैम्बर्स के सामने उनको रखिए, उन पर विचार कीजिए और आगे बढ़िए। हम समझते हैं कि यह सबसे वाजिब रास्ता होगा। आपकी प्रोक्योरमेंट की जो पालिसी है, उसमें गड़बड़ी के कारण हमारे देश को बहुत नुकसान हो चुका है, उसके कारण हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री पर अंगुली उठी, जो आज भी उठनी बंद नहीं हुई और यह राष्ट्रीय शर्म की बात है। मैं कोई आरोप नहीं लगा रहा हूं, न जो कुछ आया है उसके समर्थन में कह रहा हूं, मुझे कोई शक भी नहीं है उन पर, लेकिन यह सच है कि हमारे देश की जनता काफी परेशानी में पड़ी और आज भी परेशान है कि किन कारणों से हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री पर बोफोर्स कांड को लेकर अंगुली उठी । यह हमारी डिफेंस की दृष्टि से भी कोई मामूली बात नहीं थी, इसलिए जिस प्रक्रिया के कारण, जिस गड़बड़ी के कारण यह सब पिछले दिनों हुआ है, उस गड़बड़ी का रास्ता बंद किया जाना चाहिए और प्रोक्योरमेंट के मामले में एक नई पालिसी अख्तियार की जानी चाहिए ।

मैडम, अंतिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि माननीय मल्होत्रा जी ने हाउस के सामने जो सच्चाई रखी है और पिछले कई वर्षों से यह कहा जा रहा है कि डिफेंस वीपन्स के प्रोक्योरमेंट के मामले में कोई मिडिलमैन नहीं होता, कोई दलाल नहीं होता और दलालों तथा दलाली का रास्ता बंद करने के लिए ऐसा रास्ता अख्तियार किया गया, लेकिन यह केवल कहने भर के लिए है और उसी रास्ते पर अगर हम चल रहे हैं तो यह पूरे देश की जनता से असत्य बोला गया और यह काफी बड़ा

अपराध है और अगर यह है तो निश्चय ही यह मामला पार्लियामेंट के अंदर डिस्कशन के लिए बनता है और इसको हमारी डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री को, इस सरकार को बहुत ही गंभीरता से लेना चाहिए । आप इस मामले को जे०पी०सी० में डिस्कस कीजिए या सीक्रेट सिटिंग में डिस्कस कीजिए या आप पारदर्शिता के सिद्धान्त पर चलने वाले हैं ऐसे मामले को देश की जनता के सामने रखिए। हम समझते हैं कि उससे कोई खतरा नहीं है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी, मैडम्, मैं यह इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि आज सुबह मुझको विजिलेंस कमीशन से एक चिट्ठी मिली है, सभी मेंबर्स को मिली होगी। उसमें इसीलिए राय मांगी है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को जीरो टोलरेंस करप्शन के मामले में आप अपनी सलाह दीजिए। यह बड़ा दिलचस्प मामला है, उस पर हम लोग अपनी राय लिखेंगे। लेकिन जिस सरकार की नीति यह है जीरो टोलरेंस करप्शन के मामले में और माननीय मल्होत्रा जी ने कई ऐसे सवाल उठाए जिससे करप्शन का मामला बनता है जीरो टोलरेंस की नीति के तहत उसके अनुरूप इस मिनिस्ट्री को कुछ करना चाहिए, यह केवल मेंबर्स का ही कर्तव्य नहीं बनता है, देश की जनता का ही कर्तव्य नहीं बनता है गवर्नमेंट की सभी मिनिस्ट्रीज, सभी विंग का यह कर्तव्य बनता है कि उसको उसी स्प्रिट में लें और मेरी अपील है कि मल्होत्रा जी द्वारा लगाए गए सभी आरोपों को उसी स्प्रिट से लेते हुए जीरो टोलरेंस की नीति के तहत मामले को देखा जाए। थैंक्यू मैडम्।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Tolerance is needed much more in the House, particularly at the fag-end of the day, when we are still sitting and listening to one another. टोलरेंस यहां नहीं होना चाहिए।

श्री सतीश प्रधान (महाराष्ट्र) : मंत्री जी यदि जीरो टोलरेंस पर जाएंगे तो मुश्किल हो जाएगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We want the maximum tolerance in the House. That is what we have been discussing all the time. We should have tolerance.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Madam, we are now discussing about the procurement policy of the Defence Department and its effects on national security. This is one angle only. The National security means, we must have a comprehensive debate.

Madam, the hon. Members, who have preceded me, have actually made observations about the purchases made from foreign countries. I hope the hon. Minister would take all the observations in good spirit and find proper remedy.

Madam, I want to say something totally different. This is about

procurement made from within the country. You know, I come from deep South. There is a general feeling among the small scale manufacturers in the South that the Defence Department is not giving equal importance to all the regions of India. Their purchases are concentrated only in the Northern and Western parts of India. The manufacturers in Southern and North-Eastern regions are being discriminated against. If you think this is not true, then ignore it, but you must find out the truth. Madam, there was a proposal to print some pamphlets and to have some exhibitions in the South and the North-East, showing the items that were being purchased by the Defence Department. They wanted to display the items in the exhibition so that the small-scale manufacturers from the North East and the South could also utilise the opportunity. This practice was started in 1996. Pamphlets were printed and exhibitions were held. Subsequently, for reasons best known to the Department, this practice was stopped. I want to know the reasons why this has been stopped. I would request that this practice should be revived.

My second point is, even though a manufacturer has to supply the same items to all the three wings of the Defence Department, they have to be approved by each quality inspection cell separately. These cells are there for each defence wing -- the Army, the Air Force and the Navy. Even if the item has been approved by one quality inspection wing, the same item has again to go for inspection in the other quality inspection cell of the other wing.

Instead of that the then Defence Minister in 1996, had some idea to have only one quality inspection cell for all the three wings in the Ministry of Defence. During the Question Hour, I did raise this issue. At that time, if my memory is correct, the Defence Minister had assured and said, "This is a suggestion worth considering." When he said, "worth considering", it means an assurance given to the House; and through the House, to the country. I want to know from the hon. Defence Minister, what action has been taken in that regard. I also request the Defence Minister to publish the list of manufacturers who manufacture defence equipment in the South as well as in the North-Eastern States, who have been rejected. The Ministry of Defence in Delhi had some ill-feeling against the regional defence manufacturers; and they have been discriminated against. I would suggest some sort of corrective steps should be taken by the Ministry of Defence.

When the Government is talking about the policy, they have to concentrate on several things. I am not going to accuse any individual or any

political party. I do not know whether it is due to the systemic failure, or, it is due to mistakes committed by the executive. I do not know. The Minister has to find it out. For example, we have purchased some low level surveillance radars. I think we have purchased six radars. Now, they are all defective. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether they are in working condition or they are still defective.

The other thing is, the Government have purchased some parachutes, with spare-parts, from a foreign country. Subsequently, they were found to be defective. I want to know from the Defence Minister whether it is correct or not. If they are defective, have they been sent back to the country from where we have procured or are they lying with us? This equipment costs more than Rs.12 crores. The low-level surveillance radars cost Rs.26 crores. I am talking about the purchases made during 1992-95.

It is not only in purchases they have faltered, but, even in the maintenance of ammunition and their storage, they have not taken proper care. Ammunition worth Rs.62 crores is lying in stores for want of repairs. Ammunition worth of Rs.8 crores has been declared as unserviceable. If we add these two figures, it will come to Rs.70 crores. So, ammunition worth Rs.70 crores is lying in an improper storage room. It can't be used, when the need arises. This is the condition of ammunition.

In another case, the Government of India has decided to purchase one lakh rifles. They have entered into a contract. The cost per rifle was $65. But the person who had entered into a contract with the Defence Ministry did not execute the order. Subsequently, we have purchased one lakh rifles from somebody else at $99 per rifle, not at the rate of $65 per rifle. Once the earlier contract did not materialise, we had to purchase rifles from somebody else.

The same thing happened in the case of ammunition also. We have purchased ammunition worth Rs.5 crores. We have entered into a contract with a person who had promised to supply us the ammunition for $3.6 million. Later on, he backed out. He could not execute the order. Subsequently, we have purchased it at a cost of $4.5 million. This is how things are going on. I am not talking about the amount that is involved. Once we have purchased the equipment ..(Time-bell).. I will take only two minutes. I will give one more example. In order to upgrade our tanks, upgrade our defence system, we have decided to purchase the tank fire control system.

But, we are not able to purchase due to some political turmoil in the country from which we had obligations. Then, subsequently, the technology changed in the globe. Then, we are having the Thermal Imager Stand Alone Set. Whether we have purchased it or not, I do not know. But, at the same time, a contract was made for nearly 35 million US dollars. Out of that, we have given an advance of 10.63 million US dollars, equivalent, at that time, to nearly Rs.28 crores. That is the advance we have paid! Has that order been executed? Or is that advance still lying with the country to which we have sent it? Has any action been taken to take back either to bring the material or to take back the advance. All these things, we have go through. Once you are placing an order, we should receive the material; once you receive the material, you have to find out whether it is according to the sample. If it is not according to the sample, there should be some contractual obligations that it must be taken back. Even if such an obligation is there in the contract, it should not happen that we have inspected only after the time-frame has lapsed. That shows some sort of system failure. I hope the hon. Minister will go through all these things.

On the Quality Inspection Cell, instead of three cells operating in three wings, make it one cell. Please tell your officers that South India as well the North-East should not be discriminated against in the purchase. That is the second. Thirdly, when a contract is made, you must make it sure that the items are got according to the samples. Fourthly, make serviceable what are lying unserviceable. For that, you make a separate plan. Fifthly, please find out whether any recycling process can be made. Instead of disposing of items in the Defence Department under the guise of auction or other sales, kindly see whether there is any possibility of a recycling processfor the items. If that is done, it will save the nation's exchequer a lot of money.

With these few words, I thank you, Madam. I hope the hon. Minister will respond to these points.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vayalar Ravi. Do you still want to put some question.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Madam, I have only one question. The hon. Minister is well aware that a lot of reorts hae come about the production of the Arjun tank as well as the purchase of the T-90 tanks. Two speakers, earlier to me, referred to them. I want a specific answer from the hon. Minister. Have you already placed orders for the T-90 tanks from

Russia? And have you not placed any orders with the Avadi Tank Production Centre for the Arjun tanks for production and supply to the Ministry? That is what I want to know, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज) : उपसभापति महोदया, मैं सदन का आभारी हूं कि विस्तार में यहां पर सशस्त्र खरीदने के मामले में आज चर्चा हुई है। इस चर्चा में मौटे तौर पर ६ मुद्दे उभरकर आए हैं। पहला है जिस पर काफी जोर दिया गया है बिचौलिया, मिडलमैन के बारे में रक्षा मंत्रालय अथवा रक्षा मंत्री की ओर से यह कहने के बावजूद कि कोई बिचौलिया नहीं है हकीकत में बिचौलिया हैं यह बात मजबूती से यहां पर रखी गई है। महोदया, किसी भी शस्त्र को खरीदते समय जितने कॉन्ट्रेक्ट होते हैं उनमें एक शर्त लिखी होती है कि इसमें कोई बिचौलिया नहीं होगा और शस्त्र बेचने वाला आदमी इसको मान लेता है तभी उसके साथ किसी प्रकार का कॉन्ट्रेक्ट होता है। अगर उन्होंने वह शर्त तोड़ी तो फिर जो कॉन्ट्रेक्ट उनके साथ हुआ था वह तोड़ा जाता है। बोफोर्स का कॉन्ट्रेक्ट इसी लिए आगे तोड़ा गया था और वह परिस्थिति, जहां तक बोफोर्स तोप का संबंध है आज के दिन तक वैसी ही बनी हुई है। माननीय सदस्य श्री जयन्त मल्होत्रा जी ने यह बात यहां पर बहुत मजबूती से रखी थी कि कैसे अनेक बिचौलिया हर स्तर पर देश में और विदेश में कारगर हैं।

उनकी बातों को हम पूरे तौर पर काटना नहीं चाहेंगे । बिचौलियों के बारे में भले ही ठोस जानकारी एक साल और नौ महीनों में हमें नहीं मिली हो लेकिन यह बात बार बार कही जाती है और यह नकारना संभव नही होता है कि कहीं न कहीं अपनी तरफ से जो भी, जहां भी रिश्ता जोड़ना संभव हो, वह जोड़ते हैं । लेकिन मैं इतना ही कह सकता हूं कि पिछले एक साल नौ महीनों में ऐसा कोई भी सौदा, कोई भी कंट्रेक्ट बिचौलियों के ज़रिये से हुआ हो, किसी भी काम के बारे में हमारे पास जानकारी नहीं आई है । हमने रक्षा मंत्रालय में जाने के बाद एक नयी प्रक्रिया शुरू की है । मंत्रालय के कई जगहों पर आने के रास्ते पर और जहां रक्षा विभाग के अनेक दफ्तर राजधानी में हैं, ऐसे स्थानों पर ताले के साथ बक्स रखे थे और आज भी वह बक्से हैं । यह कह कर हमने प्रचार किया है कि अगर किसी भी मामले में आज या पहले की कोई भी जानकारी हो जो भ्रष्टाचार मिटाने में हमें मदद कर सकती है, वह जानकारी लोग दें । आग्रह होगा कि वह अपने पते के साथ दें क्योंकि यह जो बक्से हैं, इनकी चाबी हमारे हाथ में है, बाहर कहीं भी इसकी जानकारी नहीं जाएगी । यह बड़ी सेवा होगी देश की अगर जानकारी के साथ पता भी रहे कि किस के ज़रिये से यह पत्र हमारे पास आया है। पत्र बहुत आए और आते रहते हैं। आज भी आरोप किये जाते हैं । लेकिन किसी प्रकार का ठोस सबूत या पत्र आज तक मुझे

नहीं मिला है, हालांकि इस काम पर हमने अपना काफी समय लगाया है । इसलिए हम आज यही कहना चाहेंगे कि जो बिचौलिया है, वह कोई सबूत छोड़ कर नहीं जाता है।...**(व्यवधान)**

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA : Sir, Mipro was admitted by the Ministry of Defence as a middle company. It was admitted here in the House and also in the Consultative Committee for the Ministry of Defence.

श्रीमती सरला महेश्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : मंत्री जी, ठोस सबूत निकालना तो मंत्रालय का काम है । मैं समझती हूं कि किसी के पास भी आधार हो तो वह अपना आधार दे सकता है लेकिन ठोस सबूत तो आप ही निकाल सकते हैं ।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ : उपसभापति महोदया, मिपरो के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने जो बात उठाई है, मेरे पास जानकारी है मिपरो के बारे में, मैं सदन के सामने रखूंगा । महोदया, १९६२ से जबलपुर की गन फेक्टरी में एल-७० एंटी एयरक्राफ्ट तोपें बनाई जा रही हैं ।

यह बोफोर्स के लाइसेंस्ड प्रोडक्शन से काम हो रहा है। ७०० तोपें अभी तक वहां पर बनायी गयी हैं। १९९३-९४ में और २४ तोपें बनाने का आर्डर मिल गया। लेकिन दरम्यान में बोफोर्स के ऊपर पाबंदी लगायी गयी और उसके लिए जो स्पेयर्स चाहिए थे, २४ तोपें बनाने के लिए उन्हें, १९९३-९४ में इस मिप्रो कंपनी से लाया गया। यह जो आयात किया यह आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज बोर्ड ने १९९३-९४ में किया। मिनिस्ट्री आफ डिफेंस ने मिप्रो के साथ कभी भी, किसी भी प्रकार का कान्ट्रेक्ट नहीं किया है। आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज बोर्ड भी है, पिछले २ सालों में इस बोर्ड ने भी मिप्रो के साथ किसी प्रकार का कान्ट्रेक्ट नहीं किया है। यह जानकारी मेरे हाथ में है जिसको मैंने अभी सदन के सामने रखा है। इसलिए हम लोगों ने कबूल किया कि इस प्रकार की बातें होती हैं। आपके पास जो भी इसमें जानकारी है और यह भी तथ्य है कि १९९३-९४ में उनसे आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्रीज बोर्ड के जरिए इस काम के लिए कुछ चीजें, कुछ स्पेयर पार्टस खरीदे गए हैं ... **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: The HDW shares were also bought similarly.

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : हो सकता है। हम उनकी जांच कर लेंगे। जो भी बात आप कहेंगे हम उसकी जांच कर लेंगे ... **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: If we have to give

everything...*(Interruptions)*.... We are Members of Parliament and we don't have an investigative agency with us. These facts are known to your Ministry. These have been admitted by your Secretaries and it is up to the Ministry to investigate and find out the correct information. You should not give us these vague answers. We are not going to accept that.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not giving any vague answers.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: You have express information. I have given the names of the dealers. Everyone knows it, except the Ministry of Defence. This is surprising. ...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभापति : जवाब तो पूरा होने दीजिए। वे चुपचाप सुन रहे थे। मंत्री जी ने आपकी बात टालरेंस से सुनी। आप भी उनकी बात को सुन लीजिए। आपको पसंद आए, नहीं आए वह अलग बात है। पर बोलने तो दीजिए। पूरा हो जाने दीजिए ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : तो मैंने यह बता दिया कि यह तो पहली बात है जो इस बहस से एक मोटी बात उभरकर आई है। दूसरी बात यह आई है कि हमारे पास जो शस्त्र नहीं हैं वे अत्याधुनिक खरीदने चाहिए और ऐसे मजबूत खरीदने चाहिए कि जो भी हमारे शत्रु हैं उनको वह हमारे हाथ में देखकर वैसे ही बैठ जाए। जर्मन ए०जे०टी० की बात आ गयी। अत्याधुनिक है क्योंकि वह तो जो शार्टलिस्ट किया गया है - शार्टलिस्टिंग एयर फोर्स ने की है - अल्फा और हाक, तो अगर मैंने आपकी बात ठीक से सुनी तो वह यह थी कि हाक से ४० साल आगे यह जर्मन ए०जे०टी० है। तो यह अति आधुनिक चीज हम लोगों को देखनी चाहिए। उन्हें हमको खरीदना चाहिए और ये हाक आदि-आदि जो अब २० साल की पुरानी डेवलप की हुई चीजें हो गयी हैं इनकी तरफ हम लोगों की नजर नहीं जानी चाहिए। उसी तरह से लीथल वीपन्स - जैसे स्मर्च है। स्मर्च की बात हो गयी। स्मर्च के बारे में कारगिल के ही संदर्भ में विचार करना पड़ा था और केवल विचार करके वहां पर बात को सीमित नहीं रखा गया। स्मर्च का ट्रायल अभी हम लोगों ने लिया है और स्मर्च के बारे में बहुत ही तेज रफ्तार से मंत्रालय में सोच हो चुकी है और जो भी निर्णय उस पर लेना है वह निर्णय लिया जाएगा। लेकिन जब हम लोग ऐसी अत्याधुनिक चीजों के बारे में बातें करते हैं और अतिलीथल वीपन्स, जो सबसे कीमती हैं, होने चाहिए तो फिर इस चीज की भी बात करना बहुत जरूरी है और माननीय सदस्यों ने उसकी ओर जरूर इशारा किया कि जब रक्षा विभाग के लिए पैसे की बात आएगी, पैसा आवंटन करने की बजट में बात आएगी तब भी सबको बहुत ही खुलकर उसमें राय देनी होगी। तो यह बात भी ख्याल में रखनी अत्यावश्यक है। जब हम लोग इन चीजों के बारे में चर्चा करते हैं - माननीय कपिल

सिब्बल जी ने, कौन हमारा असली शत्रु है इसकी ओर इशारा किया ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : आपने किया। मैंने नहीं किया। मैं आपकी बात कह रहा हूं .. **(व्यवधान)**

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : उन्होंने यह बात कही .. **(व्यवधान)** मैंने कहा कि आपने इशारा किया और आपने यह बात कही कि मैंने चीन को इनीमी नम्बर वन करके कहा था। इस सदन में उपसभापति जी मैं ५० बार कह चुका हूं - अतिश्योक्ति है ५० बार कहने में - लेकिन मैं बार-बार कह चुका हूं। इस सदन के बाहर इस बात की चर्चा पता नहीं कितनी बार हुई है। हमने ये शब्द नहीं कहे। सब जानते हैं यह इस्तेमाल में लाया जाता है। मैं समझ नहीं पाता हूं कि हम लोग अपने पड़ोस के साथ रिश्तों के बारे में या देश की सुरक्षा के मामलों पर जब बहुत चिंतित होते हैं तो इसके बारे में क्यों इतने हल्के ढंग से बोलते हैं। मैंने यह बात जरूर कही थी जब हमसे पूछा गया कि क्या चीन भारत का एक नम्बर का शत्रु है। मैंने कहा कि नहीं। चीन हमारा शत्रु करके हम नहीं मानते। चीन के साथ हमारा विवाद है। मगर चीन के साथ हमारी बातचीत हो रही है, लगातार होती रहती है। हम लोगों के रिश्ते हैं। हमारा यह उत्तर था। जब पूछा गया कि आप यह मानेंगे कि चीन हमारे लिए सबसे एक नम्बर का खतरा है, तो मैंने कहा था कि चीन हमारे लिए एक नम्बर का खतरा भी नहीं है। लेकिन संभवतः चीन हमारे लिए खतरा बन सकता है - पार्टेशियली। लेकिन आज अभी जो कांग्रेस के सदस्य ने ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री कपिल सिब्बलः .... (व्यवधान) किताब में कहा है और आपने यह बात मान ली। उसी के बारे में वर्णन कर रहा था .. **(व्यवधान)**

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : यह बात मैं आज पहली बार नहीं मान रहा हूं। यह बात मैं पहले भी बोल चुका हूं। जिस बात को अगर आप समझ नहीं पाए तो गलती मेरी नहीं है .. **(व्यवधान)**

श्री कपिल सिब्बल :आप समझा नहीं पाए ... **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I didn't call China 'an enemy'. I didn't call China a "shatru". मैंने कहा था, श् China is a potential threat'. I said, 'it is a potential threat.' ..*(Interruptions)*..... I am not yielding ..*(Interruptions)*....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, please sit down..(Interruptions).. It is not fair. ..*(Interruptions)*....

श्री कपिल सिब्बल: जिस न्यूजपेपर ने छापा, आपने कोई कार्यवाही की?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Please understand. Between a 'potential threat' and 'enemy number one', there is a world of difference. Anyone who doesn't know the difference, doesn't know anything about threat perceptions... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: He is a fool.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is a world of difference. I didn't call anybody a fool. Why do you want to call yourself one? ..*(Interruptions)*.. There is a world of difference between 'threat' and 'an enemy'. There is invariably a difference तो उपसभापति जी, यहां पर माननीय सदस्य के उस वाक्य को लाने का मुख्य कारण यह है - मैं इस बहस को नहीं छेड़ता - मगर कारण यह है कि उन्होंने सदन में चीन कितना पैसा खर्च करता है और हम कितनी लाचारी में है इसके आंकड़े रखे। उन्होंने वे आंकड़े रखे कि ७५ बिलियन डालर से ८० बिलियन डालर चीन ने इस साल शायद खर्च किए हैं और हमारे यहां ७.८ बिलियन डालर पिछले साल का था, १९९५ का था। आज के दिन बहुत बढ़ गया तो ९ बिलियन डालर या १० बिलियन डालर तक वह पहुंच सकता है। तो १० और ८० की बात है। अब इस बात में .. **(व्यवधान)** प्रोपोरशनेट जी०एन०पी० भी आता है ... **(व्यवधान)** हमारे जी०एन०पी० और चीन के जी०एन०पी० के बारे में चर्चा जब करनी हो तो हम करें। अभी आपने जो बात कही सदन को और देश को आगाह करने के लिए आपने जो यहां पर बात कही, मैं केवल उसकी ओर इशारा कर रहा हूं कि जब हम लोग अत्याधुनिक और लीथल, इन बातों को करते हैं तो पैसा भी एक महत्व रखता है और हम लोगों की जो सीमाएं हैं तो उन सीमाओं को समझकर हमें जितनी अत्याधुनिक चीजें खरीदना संभव है और जितनी लीथल चीजें हम बना सकते हैं या खरीद सकते हैं, वह काम हमें करना चाहिए। यह हम मानते हैं और उस दिशा में हम लोग कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं।

अब उपसभापति जी, तीसरी बात जो यहां उभरकर आई और इस बात में सदन में एक राय है ऐसा मुझे दिखाई नहीं देता - या तो हम लोगों की बोली में कुछ अंतर्विरोध हमारी नजर में आया और वह यह कि हम लोगों को बड़ी मात्रा में इंडिजेनाइजेशन की ओर जाना चाहिए।

चर्चा हो गयी अर्जुन टैंक की, चर्चा हो गयी सब-मैरिंस की, मंझगाव? डॉक की और कहा गया कि हम लोगों के पास काबलियत है, लेकिन हम लोग उस का इस्तेमाल नहीं कर पा रहे हैं । चर्चा हो गयी लाइट कॉम्बेट एअरक्राफ्ट की कि कितने सालों से वह

पड़ा हुआ है और उस पर एअर फोर्स के चीफ ने या एअर फोर्स के हैडक्वार्टर्स ने कुछ टिप्पणियां की हैं - ये सारी बातें भी यहां आईं जिन में बताया गया कि एक तरफ तो हम लोगों को इंडिनाइजेशन की ओर जाना चाहिए और दूसरी ओर कहा गया कि इंडिनाइजेशन करने में हमें जितनी कामयाबी से आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, हम नहीं बढ़ पा रहे हैं । यह बात सामने आई । उपसभापति जी, दोनों बातें एक साथ हों, बहुत ही बढ़िया हैं, लेकिन दिक्कतें हैं और उन दिक्कतों को समझना बहुत जरूरी है । उपसभापति जी, लाइट कॉम्बेट एअरक्राफ्ट के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि एअर चीफ के या एअर हैडक्वार्टर्स में कुछ बड़े लोगों की इस बारे में बहुत ही रिजर्वेशंस हैं । आज सात दिन नहीं हुए, हम ने इस लाइट कॉम्बेट एअरक्राफ्ट पर मंत्रालय में एल०सी०ए० बनाने वाले हमारे साइंटिस्ट्स, इंजीनियर, एच०ए०एल० के सब से बड़े अधिकारी, एअर फोर्स के चीफ और इन सारी चीजों से एअर फोर्स से संबंध रखने वाले अधिकारियों की बैठक ली । एल०सी०ए० सालों से बन रहा है यह बात सही है, लेकिन उस को दो, तीन, चार बार उड़ाने की बात हो गयी, लेकिन वह उड़ नहीं पाया है । अब उस को अगले महीने, दो महीने में उड़ाने का संकल्प है । तो यह बहुत सारी बातें हैं और इस संबंध में हम ने यह मीटिंग ली थी और उस मीटिंग में एअर चीफ ने एल०सी०ए० की कोइ टीका नहीं की उल्टे उन्होंने बहुत ही समाधान व्यक्त किया । इसलिए मैं नहीं जानता और मैं नहीं समझ पाया कि कहां और कब ऐसी बात हो गयी है । इस बारे में कोई सार्वजनिक तौर पर हम ने तो न पढ़ा है, न सुना है । यह पहली बार हम ने सदन में सुना है, लेकिन मैं इतना बता दूं कि एअर हैडक्वार्टर्स और एअर चीफ यह एल०सी०ए० का जो काम हो रहा है, उस में पूरे तौर पर लगे हुए हैं और उस के बारे में किसी का किसी प्रकार का ....(**व्यवधान**)....

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: If you permit me, Sir, this is the report of 15th December,1999, by William John, in the 'Pioneer' where he has referred to all the facts, which I have stated before you.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I do not know.

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : उन्होंने कहा है, यह सीजन देखिए । मैं पढ़ देता हूं "The document shows that the IAF has been fighting tooth and nail over the perational capability of LCA so much that even Project Director, Prof. Narasimha, at the National Aeronautical Laboratory, Bangalore, said that the project should be shut down after the two prototypes were test- flown. The first prototype was to fly at the end of April, 1990. It is still to fly, with a new date being some time in the last quarter of 1999. Only a fortnight is left for the umpteenth deadline to be over. The objections of the IAF are as follows:

One, two, three, four or, five. I did not give you all the objections. I gave you only a few.

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : ठीक है, लेकिन एअर चीफ के बारे में मैं ने बता दिया और उस के साथ जुड़े हुए जो भी लोग हैं, उन के बारे में बताना मेरा कर्त्तव्य है । उपसभापति जी, अब सदस्य तय कर सकते हैं ....**(व्यवधान)**....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Who is Mr. William John? *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, he is a very, very effective Defence journalist... *(Interruptions)*....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is he a Defence analyst? ..*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU): Journalist, who has been writing..*(Interruptions)*....

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : उपसभापति जी, सदस्य तय कर सकते हैं कि वह एक पत्रकार के ऊपर विश्वास करें या रक्षा मंत्री पर विश्वास करें, यह उन का अधिकार है । यह मैं उन के हाथों में छोड़ देता हूं, लेकिन यह बताना मेरा कर्त्तव्य है । उपसभापति जी, आज से ७ दिन पहले हम सारे लोगों ने बैठकर मीटिंग की है, उस के मिनिट्स हैं। उस मीटिंग में इस जहाज को कितनी जल्दी हम बाहर ला पाएंगे, उसे टेस्ट कर के ऑपरेशनल कर पाएंगे - इन सारी चीजों के बारे में बहस हुई और एअर फोर्स के मुखिया उस मीटिंग में सब से अगुवाई लेकर बोलने वाले व्यक्ति थे । उपसभापति जी, मेरा फर्ज है कि मैं सदन को यह बात बता दूं । यहां हर चीज रिकॉर्ड पर रहेगी तो यह बात भी सफाई से रहनी चाहिए । अब किस पर विश्वास करें, यह आप लोगों का अधिकार है । ....**(व्यवधान)**....

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: That is not the problem. The Defence Ministry is not a holy cow. ..*(Interruptions)*....

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : मेहरबानी कीजिए, I am not yielding. I am sorry, I am not yielding ..*(Interruptions)*....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, let him finish... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You may not yield.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Many things have come out of the Defence Ministry in the 'Pioneer'.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have nothing to say about any newspaper. I am saying that a certain statement is made by an hon. Member. I am putting it on record, as I know the situation. It is for the House to decide. It is for each person to decide whom he trusts. He can say that he has no belief in the Minister of Defence. ..*(Interruptions)*....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will tell you the procedure. *(Interruptions)*. Just a minute.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka) : Madam, we have to get our doubts cleared. The Minister should be calm and patient while replying. He cannot flare up like this.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: When we addressed the Chair, there was no element of aggression. There are doubts in our minds. We want those doubts to be cleared. That is all.

श्री सतीश प्रधान : मैडम,----**(व्यवधान)**---- सदन की व्यवस्था क्या है ? जब मिनिस्टर जवाब दे रहे हैं।

तो मिनिस्टर का जवाब सुन लीजिए । अगर बाद में किसी को क्लैरीफिकेशन लेना हो तो वह पूछ सकते हैं लेकिन बार बार मत टोकिए । यह टोकना बंद कीजिए। ---**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down? ..*(Interruptions)*.... Please sit down. When a Minister or a Member makes a statement, it is part of the record. If you feel that the Minister has made a wrong statement, there is a procedure to hold him responsible. Let him make a statement. You have put some questions on the basis of the information given by the newspapers. Now he is giving you the information which he is having and it is part of the record. If you find in future that he made a wrong statement and if you are in a position to substantiate your point, you are most welcome to bring it to the notice of the Assurances Committee or the Privileges Committee. You asked certain points and he is answering them. If you are not happy, you can go before any Committee.

श्री बलवन्त सिंह रामूवालिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मिनिस्टर गुस्से से बोल रहे हैं । झगड़ा सा कर रहे हैं ।

उपसभापति : मंत्री जी, गुस्से में मत बोलिए । झगड़ा कर के मत बोलिए । आप डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर हैं। इसका मतलब थोड़े ही है कि आप हर वक्त झगड़ा करते रहें ।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : उपसभापति जी, एक और बात जो बहस में सामने आई, वह ट्रांसपेरेन्सी के बारे में आई । हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि निर्णय लेने में और प्रोक्योरमेंट के मामले में इन सारी चीजों में ट्रांसपेरेन्सी का होना जरूरी है । इसमें किसी की भी दो राय नहीं हो सकती हैं । इसलिए जो भी मुद्दे यहां आए हैं, हम उनको विवाद के मुद्दे करके नहीं मानते । मैं यह मानकर चलता हूँ कि यह सारी जो बहस हुई है, इस बहस में हम जिन बुराइयों को देख रहे हें, उन बुराइयों को हटाकर अपनी सुरक्षा का सारा काम करें, ईमानदारी के साथ करें और उसके साथ साथ देश की सुरक्षा को मद्देनजर रखकर चलें । इस पर सदन में किसी की भी दो राय नहीं हो सकती हैं ।

महोदया, अभी जो कुछ बातें सदन के सामने लाई गई हैं, उनके बारे में जितनी जानकारी मेरे पास है उतनी जानकारी मैं अभी दे दूंगा और बाकी जो मुद्दे हैं उन पर मैं बाद में जानकारी भेज दूंगा। एक बात जो यहां छेड़ी गई, वह यह कि ३० हजार करोड़ से ४० हजार करोड़ रुपए का जंक माल पड़ा हुआ है, जो सुरक्षा विभाग ने पिछले कई सालों से खरीदा हुआ है। हम जानते हैं कि सीएजी इन चीजों के बारे में जांच करती है। सीएजी की एक ताजा रिपोर्ट आज ही आई है, मेरे हाथों में तो आज ही आई है, एक या दो दिन पहले यह सीएजी ने दी होगी । सीएजी की रिपोर्ट जिन मुद्दों पर आती है, जो जो मुद्दे उसमें छेड़े जाते हैं, उन पर तत्काल कार्यवाही मंत्रालय में पूरी होती है । मैं सदन को इश्वस्त कर सकता हूँ इस बात को लेकर, कि यह जो ३० हजार करोड़ या ४० हजार करोड़ के बीच का जो भी जंक जहां पड़ा हुआ है, उसके बारे में अगर जांच अभी तक नहीं हुई होगी तो वह जांच करने की कार्यवाही करेंगे और उससे जो निष्कर्ष निकलता है उसको सदन के सामने हम रख देंगे ।

यह बताया गया कि हमारे टैंक और हवाई जहाज स्पेयर पाट्र्स के अभाव के कारण चल नहीं पा रहे हैं, इस बात में सत्यता नहीं है। हमारे पास आज के दिन और यह केवल आज के दिन नहीं, कोई यह न समझे कि अचानक खरीद हुई है या कारगिल को लेकर खरीद हुई, हमारे टैंक और हमारे जहाजों को सम्पूर्ण तौर पर कार्य करने के काबिल रखने का काम हमेशा बना रहता है और उसमें किसी भी प्रकार की परेशानी के लिए गुंजाइश नहीं है । अर्जुन टैंक के बारे में एक ठोस प्रश्न पूछा गया कि क्या उसके लिए

हमने आर्डर दिया है । हमने यह बात दोनों सदनों में कही थी और सार्वजनिक तौर पर कही थी कि १२४ टैंक्स का आर्डर केबिनेट कमेटी ऑन सिक्यूरिटी ने क्लीअर किया और मंत्रालय ने उस निर्णय पर अमल करने के लिए कदम उठाया । लेकिन अर्जुन टैंक के आर्मर को लेकर ट्रायल होना है, वह अभी तक पूरा नहीं हुआ है । असल में हम एक परेशानी में पिछले दो महीनों में पड़े क्योंकि अर्जुन टैंक के लिए जो इंजन और अन्य चीजों की खरीद हो रही है, वह देश के भीतर नहीं बन रही हैं, उन्हें बाहर से लाया जाता है और जिनसे उनको लाना है उन्होंने कुछ समय बांधकर दे दिया और कहा कि अगर अमुक तारीख तक आप इसको नहीं खरीदेंगे तो फिर आगे दाम बढ़ जाएंगे । अब एक तरफ उसको रोकना और दूसरी तरफ चूंकि टैंक का अंतिम आर्डर तो सेना को देना है और सेना का कहना है कि आर्डर हम तभी दे सकते हैं जब आर्मर का पूरा ट्रायल होकर हमको विश्वास हो जाएगा कि यह टैंक हमारे काम के लायक है । यह काम अभी होना बाकी है । मुझे डी०आर०डी०ओ० की ओर से और आर्डिनेंस फैक्टरी की ओर से यह बात बताई गई है, हमको लिखित संदेश मिला है कि 'हम आशा करते हैं कि जनवरी महीने के अंत तक यह कार्य पूरा हो जाएगा', तो अगर यह कार्य जनवरी महीने के अंत तक पूरा हो जाता है तो उसी क्षण १२४ टैंकों का यह आर्डर चला जाएगा । अब इसी के साथ पूछा गया कि टी-९० टैंक का आर्डर दिया है क्या । टी-९० टैंक का कोई आर्डर नहीं दिया है । यह बात सही है कि ट्रायल के लिए चार टैंक आए थे, उनका ट्रायल हो गया, उसकी रिपोर्ट पर अभी अध्ययन जारी है और अध्ययन पूरा होने के बाद इस बारे में कुछ सोचा जाएगा । अब अध्ययन सिर्फ यहां तक नहीं हो रहा कि हमें जिस प्रकार का टैंक चाहिए उस दृष्टि से यह टैंक हमारे काबिल है या नहीं, केवल यहां तक नहीं बल्कि अध्ययन यहां तक हो रहा है कि इस टैंक की बराबरी के दूसरे जो टैंक हैं, जैसे टी-७२ की बराबरी इससे की जाती है, तो टी-७२ और टी-९० की तुलना करके देखा जाएगा और उस तुलना में अगर यह सबूत आ जाता है कि टी-९० टी-७२ की तुलना में श्रेष्ठ टैंक है, तब इस टैंक को किस दाम पर खरीदा जा सकता है इस पर बातचीत शुरू होगी । यह उस टैंक को बनाने वाले लोगों को बताया गया है । तो इसलिए आज के दिन टी-९० टैंक का ट्रायल होकर रिपोर्ट आई और आर्मी हैडक्वार्टर में उसकी जांच हो रही है और दो-तीन चीजों की प्रक्रिया होने पर अगर हमारे प्रश्नों का हमें समाधानकारक जवाब मिल जाएगा तो उस टैंक को खरीदने की बात होगी ।

उपसभापति महोदया, कुछ और प्रश्न आए, जैसे सब-मेरीन्स का हमने ख्याल नहीं किया या एयर बॉर्न अरली वार्निंग सिस्टम आदि चीजों में हम पीछे रहे, करगिल में स्नो शूज़ और उस सर्दी में लड़ने के लिए गए हुए जवानों को जूते, कपड़े नहीं मिले आदि

इस प्रकार की बातें यहां कही गईं । मैं यहां स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूं कि जो जवान करगिल में लड़ने गए उन्हें न तो बूटों की, न कपड़ों की, न शस्त्रों की, किसी चीज़ की कमी नहीं रही और वे पूरे विश्वास के साथ उस लड़ाई में उतरे । किसी भी प्रकार का शक मन में रख कर वह उस लड़ाई में नही उतरे। यह बात जो बार-बार कही जाती है और हम इस बात को बाहर भी कभी-कभी पढ़ते हैं कि जवानों को स्नो बूट्स नहीं दिए गए, उनके ठीक कपड़े वहां पर लड़ने के लिए नहीं थे। उपसभापति महोदया, जब मैं पहली बार पिछले साल के मार्च महीने के अंत में या अप्रेल के शुरू में सियाचिन गया था तब हमने जो वहां पर स्थिति देखी थी तब बूट्स, कपड़े व हाथ के ग्लाउज से लेकर उनके माथे पर जो टोपी होनी चाहिए इन सारी चीजों को खरीदने का सारा कार्य हमने किया था। जो जवान वहां पर जाते हैं उतने ही लोगों के लिए नहीं खरीदा था उसका दुगुना हमने खरीदा था। हमने वहां पर यह भी देखा था कि स्नो मोबाइल जैसी एक छोटी सी चीज जिसकी कीमत करीब दो लाख से कम है, वहां टूटकर पड़ी हुई थी और उसकी मरम्मत नहीं हुई थी। हमने स्नो मोबाइल अपने जीवन में कभी नहीं देखी थी। हमने पूछा कि यह क्या चीज है, इसका क्या उपयोग सियाचिन ग्लेसियर में होता है? जब मुझे बताया गया कि इसका क्या उपयोग होता है और यह टूटी हुई चीज वहां साल भर से पड़ी हुई थी तो मुझे जो भी गुस्सा आया था वह मैंने व्यक्त किया था। हमने वहां पर स्थिति को देखने के लिए अधिकारियों को भेजा था और अब ऐसे भी आदेश हैं कि हमेशा ऐसे स्थानों पर जाना चाहिए तथा जवानों की जो आवश्यकता हैं वहां जाकर, उनको देख कर समझना चाहिए और उनको पूरा करना चाहिए। तो यह काम हम लोगों ने किया था और इसलिए जब यह कारगिल की समस्या हमारे सामने आ गई तब किसी भी चीज की कमी नहीं रही। हम सदन को इसलिए इस बात पर भी आश्वस्त करना चाहते हैं कि मेहरबानी करके इस बात को कभी फिर नहीं उठाया जाए, क्योंकि इसमें तथ्य नहीं है।

उपसभापति महोदया, एक बात यह भी कही गई कि हम लोगों ने कुछ पुरानी चीजें खरीदी, जैसे माइन प्रोटेक्टेड व्हीकल की चर्चा यहां पर हुई। यह सही है कि वह बहुत पुरानी नहीं है। तब भी वह दस साल से लेकर १२ साल पुरानी है। माइन प्रोटेक्टेड व्हीकल को अति आवश्यक बताते हुए सेना ने बहुत आग्रह किया था। चूंकि आग्रह करने का कारण यह था कि कश्मीर वादी में आतंकवादी इनका भरपूर उपयोग कर रहे हैं।

उपसभापति : एंटी पर्सनल माइन।

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : जी हां, तो उसके चलते परेशानियां थी। हमारे जवानों को बहुत चोट लगती थी और वह मारे भी जाते थे। तो इस संदर्भ में एक ऐसे व्हीकल की आवश्यकता सेना के अधिकारियों ने महसूस की। यह कहां से खरीदी जाए तो इसके लिए

बड़े देशों में हमारे जितने डिफेंस अटेचिज थे तथा जहां यह मिलना सम्भव था वहां उनको बताया गया। तो अमेरिका से एंटी माइन प्रोटेक्टेड व्हीकल का दाम बीस-बाईस लाख का सामने आया। किसी का इससे आधा आठ-दस लाख के बीच में आया और दक्षिण अफ्रीका के डिफेंस अटेचिज की ओर से यह बात बताई गई कि यहां वह व्हीकल हैं जिसको देश में अपार्थिड समाप्त होने के पहले इस्तेमाल में लाया जाता था तथा अब यह व्हीकल यहां पर बहुत पड़े हुए हैं लेकिन अच्छे हैं और हम लोगों के काम के लायक हैं। सेना ने उसमें से कुछ व्हीकल यहां पर मंगा लिए, उनका ट्रॉयल हो गया और उसका दाम भी अन्य किसी भी व्हीकल से आधे से ज्यादा दिखाई दिया तो उन व्हीकलों में से ९० व्हीकल खरीदने का सेना का फैसला हुआ। जिस परिस्थिति में उनको खरीदा गया और जैसा दाम का मामला उसमें आया तो उसको देखते हुए हम यह मानकर चलते हैं कि वह निर्णय लेना आवश्यक था और वह निर्णय लेना ठीक था। हम लोगों को आगे अगर इससे अच्छा कोई व्हीकल मिले, अत्याधुनिक मिले और ज्यादा दाम में नहीं लेकिन हम लोगों को सही दाम में मिले तो हम जरूर इस व्हीकल को छोड़ कर दूसरे व्हीकल को खरीदना चाहेंगे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Defence Minister, were the nti-personnel mine vehicles effective in Kashmir?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Yes, they have been effective. Out of 90 vehicles, 45 are being used in Jammu and Kashmir; 25 are being used in the North-East, where also our soldiers are facing mines, and 20 vehicles came only a month ago. Ten of them are going to Jammu and Kashmir -- perhaps, they may already have gone to Jammu and Kashmir --- and ten to the North-East. The Home Ministry has either already acquired or in the process of acquiring some of these vehicles.

माननीय सदस्य विरूम्मी जी ने दक्षिण और नार्थ ईस्ट की बात यहां पर कही है। उन्होंने कहा है कि दक्षिण को डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट इक्वल ट्रीटमेंट नहीं दे रहा है।

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं यह बता दूं कि हमारे सुरक्षा से जुड़े हुए जो बड़े कारखानें हैं, बड़े उद्योग हैं, वह दक्षिण में जितने हैं - आर्डिनेंस फैक्टरी की बात मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं, आर्डिनेंस फैक्टरी यह तो बहुत पुराने कारखानें हैं, वहां पर नये कारखाने नहीं लगे हैं, लेकिन पिछले 20-25 सालों में देश की सुरक्षा से जुड़ी हुई चीजों को बनाने वाली हमारी लेबोरटीज और उसको प्रोडक्शनाइज करने वाले हमारे कारखाने जितने दक्षिण के तमिलनाडु, आन्ध्र प्रदेश और कर्णाटक इन तीन राज्यों में हैं। ----(व्यवधान)----

श्री वायालार रवि: केरल में दो लेबोरटीज हैं।

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज : केरल में कारखाने वगैरह ज्यादा नहीं हैं। लेकिन वहां पर लेबोरटीज हैं और रेअर अर्थ का कुछ काम वहां पर हो रहा है। ऐसी बात भी नहीं है कि वहां पर कुछ नहीं है। लेकिन इन तीन राज्यों में जितना हम लोगों का काम हो रहा है वह देश के किसी भी हिस्से में नहीं हो रहा है। अब कोई यह कह कि ये बड़े-बड़े कारखाने हैं और ये बड़े-बड़े कारखाने बहुत लोगों को काम भी देते हैं, बहुत कीमती चीजों को बना भी लेते हैं। मगर उसके साथ-साथ डिफेंस में एक बात बहुत जरूरी चलती है और वह यह है कि जितना कंपोनेंट्स बाहर से आता है - जो छोटे कारखानों के जरिए बनाकर खरीदे जाते हैं वह उन्हीं इलाको में - असल में कारखानों के आसपास जमीन उनको देकर वहां उन चीजों को बनवा कर उनको खरीदा जाता है। इसीलिए हमारा आपसे यह आग्रह है कि फिर आप एक बार इस पर नजर डाले तो जो शिकायत है, उस शिकायत का जबाव आपको निश्चित तौर पर मिल जाएगा।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : Mr. Virumbi did not understand what you said. Please explain to him in Tamil.

श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज :उपसभापति महोदया, मैंने करीब-करीब सभी सवालों का जबाव दे दिया है।

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Mr. Minister, can I put a question to you? I am a layman and I don't understand the complications of defence procurement. Shri Jayant Kumar Malhoutra has raised a number of serious issues. The whole purpose of that is to point out that there is not sufficient defence preparedness, security is leaking, there is wastage of an enormous amount - Rs.30,000 crores, Rs.40,000 crores -- middlemen are being used, etc. All these are pointing to some sort of a major corruption. Mr. Minister, what I am requesting you is -- I have listened to him and some others -- are you thinking in terms of setting up some sort of a Parliamentary committee so that it can set at rest all doubts and there is no suspicion about the way the defence procurement is being done. Can I get an answer to this question?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : If I am given any specific issue -- the hon. Member who raised the discussion has referred to some of the specifics -- I will certainly be happy to have that investigated. There is a Standing Committee of Parliament on Defence, and if there is any information that the Standing Committee desires to have, I am prepared to present that information to the Standing Committee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, the discussion is over because we have other matters also. We have got some statements. ...*(Interruptions)*... Biplabbabu, please sit down.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA : Madam, I have an important question to put.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We have had enough discussion, more than the two-and-a-half hours which was allotted for it. If there are still some more queries, we can have a full-fledged discussion on it.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA : Madam, I had put an important question to the hon. Minister, but he has not answered my question. I must insist that this two-minute question must be answered.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Madam, please give me two minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...It is very important because after two years, this debate has taken place. The other things will happen, but this is a crucial matter. I suggest that you give me just two minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is already quarter to nine. There is a statement to be made by the Minister. There are about 30 special mentions too.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Madam, my question is very simple. The hon. Minister says that he is going to investigate about the Rs.30,000 crores worth of what I call 'junk'. What has he been doing for the last three-four years? Nothing has happened and so much money is lying all over. I have verified from seniormost people from the armed forces that this figure is an under-statement. This is point number one.

Number two is, Madam, he says that there is no problem with regard to spare parts. We got into submarine business in 1967. Two years before, the Chinese got into it. We have 19 submarines, of which only six are seaworthy and the rest are dumped because there are no spare parts. That is a fact. Someone must answer these questions. MiG-21s were sent to Russia for updating because we do not have spares or the technology or the capability of doing it in the country.

श्री जार्ज फर्नान्डीज : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं पहले यह बात बता दूं कि मैं केवल एक साल नौ महीने वहां रहा हूं, दो साल और चार साल नहीं रहा हूं, नं०-१ और नं०-२ आप दो साल से इस प्रयास में थे कि इस पर बहस हो यानी हमारी सरकार बनने

से पहले से आप इस प्रयास में थे कि बहस हो तो बीस और चालीस हजार की जंग से लेकर जो भी बातें हैं, पिछले साल और ९ महीने में इसमें जहां-जहां, जो-जो जांच करना संभव है वह की है और आज इस बहस के चलते जो भी बातें उभरकर आई हैं उन पर जो भी जांच करना जरूरी है, वह जांच हम करेंगे और उससे जो भी निष्कर्ष निकलेगा, हम सदन को उसकी जानकारी दे देंगे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have a statement by Shri Sharad Yadav, the Minister of Civil Aviation. ...*(Interruptions)*...I have to take this up, neither before nor after. This is a matter which I have to take up. *(Interruptions)* Do not interrupt, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...Mr. Minister, please lay the statement on the Table.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

RE: Discrimination between Air Hostesses of Air India and Indian Airlines as regards retirement age

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI SHARAD YADAV): Madam, I lay on the Table a statement regarding the Special Mention raised by Shri Shatrughan Sinha, M.P., relating to discrimination between Air Hostesses of Air India and Indian Airlines as regards retirement age.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The statement is laid on the Table. We have got 37 Special Mentions. I do not think the Members will raise them. ...*(Interruptions)*... Everything is laid on the Table. The other day, we had to adjourn the House. This is the last Session of this millennium and how can we delay any more? What is the time now?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Special Mentions?

VALEDICTORY REMARKS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will have a special Session for Special Mentions! We can recommend it to the hon. Chairman. The Government representatives are present here and the Leader of the House is also here. We should have a special Session for Special Mentions! The word, Special Mentions' looks funny. Are the rest of the things we raise in the House not special?